

THE
CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

APRIL, 1869.

I.—GALILEO AND THE CHURCH.*

FOR nearly three hundred years the vast majority of the English race have regarded the name of the Roman Church as the synonym of immorality, intolerance, and oppression. Wherever this race was found, for most of that long period, her cause was considered so hopeless that little effort was made to put it on a better footing. But a generation ago a movement was inaugurated in England and in America looking to her rehabilitation, characterized by zeal, ability, and scholarship. This movement has, day by day, become more formidable, so that now there is, in every center of population, a herald proclaiming to English-speaking men that they are entirely mistaken. Every count in the Protestant indictment is denied with fervor and dogmatic positiveness; and by none more fervidly and positively than by the conductor of *The Catholic World*. In recent issues of this magazine appeared two remarkable articles, bearing the caption "Galileo Galilei, The Florentine Astronomer," written in defense of the Church, and in detraction of the Florentine philosopher. The intelligent Protestant reader at once recognizes these articles as a contribution to the exculpatory Catholic literature in which the period is so rife. As the writer charges Protestants with dealing unjustly with the Church in this old controversy, as he boldly

* Articles on *Galileo Galilei, the Florentine Astronomer*, in *The Catholic World*, for December, 1868, and January, 1869.

denies that the Church persecuted science in the person of Galileo, and as he detracts from the high estimate in which the world has long held him, we have thought it fitting to go over the whole subject as thoroughly as the facilities at our command would permit. We have accumulated some rich literary materials not accessible to the common reader, and these we propose to elaborate into a full historical sketch of Galileo's controversy with the Church. In this we hope to do justice to the Holy See, to Galileo, and thereby to our readers.

At an early period in our investigation one fact struck us forcibly: The anxiety of Catholic apologists to relieve the Holy See of the odium it brought upon itself by its treatment of Galileo. Frequent and learned attempts to do this have been made during the last generation. In the year 1838, an article appeared in *The Dublin Review*—a publication established by Cardinal Wiseman contemporaneously with the *renaissance* of Romanism in England—which is certified by good Catholic authority as giving “the best statement of the case which, up to that period, had ever been presented to English readers.” This article, for some time incorrectly attributed to Wiseman himself, was republished in Cincinnati, with an American preface, in 1844. We have been unable to obtain this document, but it is not probable that it contains valuable matter not found in later publications. In 1858, M. Biot, an eminent French scientist and a pious Catholic, made a defense, in four articles contributed to the *Journal des Savants*. To M. Biot's peculiar line of argument we shall have occasion to refer hereafter. It does not appear that American pens have been laid under contribution until *The Catholic World* gave us its two articles in December and January. As the writer of these articles is a man of ability, learning, and literary skill, as he has said every thing important that can be said on the Church side of the subject, and especially as he writes for the American public, we shall pay particular attention to what he has written, though we shall not write controversially farther than the nature of the questions discussed and the demands of the occasion seem to require.

The thoughtful reader of the articles in *The Catholic World* will first note the *élan* with which they are written—that assured confidence which not unfrequently leads to victory. The writer first tells

the story in this exaggerated form: "Generally speaking, English and American boys emerge from their college reading with an idea, more or less vague, that the moment Galileo announced the doctrine of the earth's rotation he was seized upon by the Inquisition, cast into prison, tortured in various ways, until all his bones were broken; that he pretended to recant, but, with broken bones aforesaid, stood up erect, stamped his foot, and thundered out '*E pur si muove*' (and yet it moves).'" This wretched caricature is characterized as "the wretched play that so long has had a sort of historic Black Crook run," which is "now about to be swept away with other old rubbish," when "the curtain will fall, never again to rise." *The Catholic World* further says: "We wish at once to present the Galileo story as truly told; for soon there will be nothing left of it to discuss, and the moving drama of

'The starry Galileo, with his woes,'

will cease to be played to crowded and delighted anti-Catholic audiences." Now, we do not hesitate to say that the opinions commonly held by Protestants touching this controversy need some rectification; neither do we hesitate to say that, when all due rectification is made, the skirts of the Roman Church are not cleared. But to our task.

Astronomy is the oldest of the sciences. As long ago as the time when Abraham herded his cattle and folded his sheep on Chaldean plains, men had some knowledge of the stars. Those who made the first careful observation of the heavens were not poets and philosophers; they were sailors, farmers, and shepherds. The early names applied to celestial phenomena signify as much. The Moon was called the Measurer—the measurer of time; "For time," says a great authority, "was measured by nights, and moons, and winters, long before it was reckoned by days, and suns, and years." The Greek sailor's "sailing stars" were the *Pleiades*; and the name is from *plein*, to sail. The early Latins were farmers, as the early Greeks were sailors. They called the *Pleiades Virgiliae*, from *virga*, a sprout or twig, because these stars became visible in Italy at the opening of the summer. Having made this rude beginning, astronomy passed from the hand of the sailor and the farmer, who sought in it only immediate uses, to the hand of the poet and the

philosopher. The latter cultivated it with assiduity, and, considering his disadvantages, with great success. Some of the earliest Greek philosophers had remarkably correct ideas of the form and motions of the heavenly bodies. Thus, Pythagoras, that great man belonging to the sixth century, B. C.—a name so shadowy as to be almost mythical—taught that the earth was round, that it revolved around the sun, and that it was small compared with other of the heavenly bodies. Pythagoras was probably the author of the heliocentric astronomy. Accordingly, when such theologians as Turretine, in the seventeenth century, sought to bring the heliocentric theory into disrepute, they said it had a Pagan origin, and called it that “false Pythagorean doctrine.” But, strange to say, fuller knowledge led to error. The Alexandrian astronomers were far better informed than any that had gone before them—far better than any of their contemporaries; and yet, from the schools of Alexandria, in the second century of our era, went forth an astronomical theory bearing the great name of Ptolemy, false to nature, and yet a theory that was almost universally received for fifteen hundred years.

The Middle Ages afford an excellent illustration of the way in which the very name of a great man sometimes comes to hang like an incubus upon the world, narrowing the mind, stifling inquiry, preventing progress; perhaps the whole history of the human mind affords no better. We refer to the dreadful tyranny of Aristotle throughout that long and dark period. The philosophers of those ages were his followers; that is, they clung to Aristotelian names, methods, and forms; but so far from being Aristotelian in spirit, they did not so much as divine what that spirit was. Now, it had so happened, that the Aristotelians had taken the Ptolemaic astronomy under their patronage; the fortunes of the philosophy and the astronomy were bound up together. There was no future for the mind of Europe until the fetters with which the Stagirite had bound it should be broken. Copernicus and Galileo, Kepler and Luther, Bacon and Newton were the champions of intellectual liberty, who broke these fetters and let the soul go free. Further, it is noteworthy that there is evermore a close alliance between theology and philosophy; and this because theology is but philosophy applied to religion. This is a capital fact in the case before us. The Church of the Middle Ages was Aristotelian; those learned pedants, the school-men, spent

their lives in adjusting the relations of Christianity to the philosophy taught by Aristotle in the Lyceum three and a half centuries before the giving of the Gospel. The theologian, the Aristotelian, and the Ptolemaist formed a triple league too formidable to be trifled with. Now, with these facts before us, knowing what we do of human nature, of the ecclesiastical spirit, of the genius of the Papacy, and of the moral and intellectual condition of Europe at the opening of the Modern Era, what could we expect other than that the man would meet with opposition who, in the sixteenth or seventeenth century, should treat the prevailing philosophy with defiance?—an opposition that would become persecution when that defiance involved theological dogmas? This *a priori* view is completely borne out by the facts.

The time came at length when the power of this triple alliance should be broken. Remembering that in the sixteenth century Europe and the Church were synonymous, it is apparent that the iconoclasts must come from among the Church's own children. Nicholas Copernicus struck the first stalwart blow—a blow to be repeated until the chains imposed by superstition, dogmatic faith, and an antiquated philosophy should fall from the mind of Europe. Copernicus was a devout Catholic, and a priest. He was the nephew and protégé of the Bishop of Ermeland; he consented to the publication of his *De Revolutionibus* only after much urging by Cardinal Schomberg, who also defrayed the expense; he dedicated it to the Pope, while the Bishop of Culm superintended the printing. The bearing of these facts upon the question at issue will be considered hereafter.

The Catholic World attempts to prove that in the two generations intervening between Copernicus and Galileo, the heliocentric astronomy made considerable headway. The object is twofold: 1. To show that the men who held and taught the doctrine during that period were not molested by the Church; and 2. As a consequence that Galileo must have been responsible for the treatment he received in 1616. But, with all its diligence, it can gather only a dozen names, and, with one or two exceptions, these are so obscure that even well-read men have no knowledge of them. Touching the status of the Copernican astronomy, at the time when Galileo became its most distinguished champion, we quote from the calm

and dispassionate Hallam, to whom Macaulay paid the highest compliment when he said he wrote history like a judge, and not like an advocate :

"It can excite no wonder that the system of Copernicus, simple and beautiful as it is, met with little encouragement for a long time after its promulgation, when we reflect upon the natural obstacles to its reception. Mankind can, in general, take these theories of the celestial movements only upon trust from philosophers ; and in this instance it required a very general concurrence of competent judges to overcome the repugnance of what called itself common sense, and was, in fact, a prejudice as natural, as universal, and as irresistible as could influence human belief. With this was united another, derived from the language of Scripture ; and, though it might have been sufficient to answer, that phrases implying the rest of the Earth and motion of the Sun are merely popular, and such as those who are best convinced of the opposite doctrine must employ in ordinary language, this was neither satisfactory to the vulgar, nor recognized by the Church. Nor were the astronomers, in general, much more favorable to the new theory than either the clergy or the multitude. They had taken pains to familiarize their understandings with the Ptolemaic hypothesis ; and it may be often observed that those who have once mastered a complex theory are better pleased with it than with one of more simplicity. The whole weight of Aristotle's name, which, in the sixteenth century, not only biased the judgment, but engaged the passions, connected, as it was, with general orthodoxy and preservation of established systems, was thrown into the scale against Copernicus."*

That could not have been an age of much astronomical knowledge, or, indeed, of much scientific attainment of any sort, when Francesco Sizzi was accounted an eminent astronomer. This man, a townsman and contemporary of Galileo, was a Professor of Padua. To prove that Jupiter had no satellites he reasoned thus :

"There are seven windows given to animals in the domicile of the head, through which the air is admitted to the tabernacle of the body, to enlighten, to warm, and nourish it ; which windows are the principal parts of the microcosm or little world, two nostrils, two eyes, two ears, and one mouth ; so in the heavens, as in a macrocosm or great world, there are two favorable stars, Jupiter and Venus ; two unpropitious, Mars and Saturn ; two luminaries, the Sun and Moon, and Mercury alone undecided and indifferent. From which, and many other phenomena of nature, such as the seven metals, etc., which it were too tedious to enumerate, *we gather the number of planets is necessarily seven.* Moreover, the satellites are invisible to the naked eye, and, therefore, can exercise no influence upon the earth ; and, therefore, would be useless ; and, therefore, do not exist. Besides, as well the Jews and other ancient nations, as modern Europeans, have adopted the divisions of the week into seven days, and have named them from the seven planets ; now, if we increase the number of planets, this whole system falls to the ground."

* "Introduction to the Literature of Europe," Harper's edition, vol. I, p. 395.

Having thus paved the way, we are ready to introduce the great Florentine upon the stage.

GALILEO GALILEI was born in Pisa, February 28, 1564. He was intended for the medical profession by his father, who did his utmost to repress the young man's longing for mathematical studies. But his bent of nature was too decided to be overcome, and, finally, the father yielded his own wishes to his son's persistence. It was in the Cathedral of his native city that he discovered, in his eighteenth year, the isochronism of the vibrations of the pendulum; as it was from the top of its Leaning Tower that he subsequently performed the experiments which refuted the cherished Aristotelian notion touching the velocity of falling bodies. In his twenty-fourth year Galileo was appointed to a professorship of mathematics in the University of Pisa. Having drawn down upon himself the enmity of the Aristotelians, he was glad to resign this position, which he did in 1592, accepting the chair of mathematics at Padua. Here he remained until 1610, when he went to Florence. During all this time he followed, with the greatest ardor, the bent of his genius. It is not known at what time he embraced the Copernican doctrine; but there is positive testimony to prove that, aggressive and intrepid as was his spirit, he for some time hesitated to avow his faith, for fear of the consequences such avowal was likely to bring upon him. This testimony is afforded by a letter written by Galileo to Kepler in 1597. We give a portion of this letter which bears directly upon the issues raised in the present discussion. After acknowledging the receipt of Kepler's *Mysterium Cosmographicum*, he continues:*

"I have as yet read nothing beyond the preface of your book, from which, however, I catch a glimpse of your meaning, and feel great joy in meeting so powerful an associate in the pursuit of truth, and consequently such a friend of truth itself; for it is deplorable that there should be so few who care about truth, and who do not persist in their perverse mode of philosophizing. But as this is not a fit time for lamenting the melancholy condition of our times, but for congratulating you on your elegant discoveries in confirmation of the truth, I shall only add a promise to peruse your book dispassionately, and with a conviction that I shall find in it much to admire. I shall do this the more willingly, because, many years ago, I became a convert to the opinions of Copernicus, and by that theory have fully succeeded in explaining many phenomena, which, on the contrary hypothesis, are

* It is interesting to know that these two great philosophers, living in the midst of an intellectual waste, cheered each other by a correspondence, continued to the close of Kepler's life, in 1630.

altogether inexplicable. I have arranged many arguments and confutations of the opposite opinions, which, however, I have not yet dared to publish, *fearing the fate of our master Copernicus*, who, although he has earned immortal fame among a few, yet by an infinite number (for so only is the number of fools to be measured) is denounced and derided. If there were more such as you I would venture to publish my speculations, but since this is not so, I shall take time to consider it."

Galileo does not appear to have openly taught the heliocentric astronomy previous to the year 1604. After that time he is its most powerful champion. Being temporarily in Venice, in 1609, he heard that a Hollander had invented an instrument by which distant objects were made to appear near at hand. His mind quickly acted upon this hint, and he speedily produced a telescope, first, one that magnified three times; then a larger one, that magnified eight times; and, finally, one still larger, that magnified thirty-three times. With the latter instrument, "a baby telescope," as *The Catholic World* calls it, a mere leaden organ-pipe, thirty inches in length, with two small lenses, he made the most surprising discoveries. He resolved some of the nebulae in the milky way, saw the mountains in the moon, discovered the forty stars in the Pleiades and the four satellites of Jupiter. When he announced these discoveries in his *Nuncius Sidereus*, published in March, 1610, he created the most profound sensation. The few scattered disciples of Copernicus heard with astonishment and delight; the hosts who followed the name of Aristotle and Ptolemy listened with astonishment, but with incredulity and with rage. With his thirty-inch organ-pipe, armed with two small lenses, the philosopher had dashed the Ptolemaic astronomy to atoms; the great Florentine had won for himself immortal honors, and, at the same time, made himself obnoxious to persecution. There was nothing left for the Ptolemaists but to deny the correctness of the astronomer's observations, to cover his discoveries with ridicule, and himself with insult. When Galileo offered to give them ocular demonstrations, some refused to look through his glass. It was at this time Sizzi delivered himself of the amazing utterances quoted above; also, that Caccini, a Dominican monk, preached the famous sermon, in which he quoted the words, "*Ye men of Galileo, why stand ye gazing up into heaven?*" a sermon in which he attacked Galileo personally, denounced mathematics as a diabolical art, and declared that the mathematicians, as the authors of every heresy, should be

banished from every Christian land.* A young German, Martin Horky, declared, "I will never concede his four new planets to that Italian, though I die for it"—an utterance, in which he stated, in the tersest language, the spirit of the old astronomers. Galileo held on his way, replying to men like Sizzi, "that although their arguments might have force in inducing us to believe beforehand that no more than seven planets existed, they were hardly sufficient to annihilate those new ones which were actually seen to exist." But he wrote to Kepler: "O, my beloved Kepler, how I wish that we could have one laugh together! Here, at Padua, is the principal professor of philosophy, whom I have repeatedly and urgently requested to look at the moon and planets through my telescope, which he pertinaciously refuses to do. Why, my dear Kepler, are you not here? What shouts of laughter we should have at all this solemn folly! and figure the professor of Pisa laboring before the Grand Duke with logical arguments, as if with magical incantations, to charm the new planets out of the sky!" Flushed with his great discoveries, and with his momentary triumph over his enemies, Galileo could well afford to write in such a strain; but the time was drawing near when the controversy should become a serious business, and not at all a laughing matter.

The great astronomer was now at the zenith of his popularity. He received a large salary from the State; and from nobles and princes testimonials of their esteem and admiration. He had wealth, reputation, and honors. It is due to Rome to say, that when he visited that city, in 1611, he was treated in a manner corresponding to his talents and learning. He set up his best telescope in the garden of Cardinal Bandini, and, for weeks, gave an opportunity for all who chose to behold the wonders of the upper deep. Returning to Florence, he became involved in a philosophical controversy, and wrote learnedly upon hydrostatics. But, before hastening on to his decline and fall, we must state *The World's* explanation of Galileo's condemnation in 1616.

We have already stated the relations of Copernicus to the Church and to the hierarchy. *The Catholic World* says: "The Copernican

* *The Catholic World* lays some stress upon the fact that the Chief of the Dominican Order rebuked Caccini for this sermon. It does not so much as mention the fact that he was soon after promoted to a higher position.

theory was, so to speak, born, cradled, nurtured, and developed in the Church, and under the very shadow of St. Peter's." Undoubtedly, the Church is entitled to such credit as the facts give her; but it is proper to remind those writers who say the Church, as a Church, has never persecuted, but only individuals—who say the seven Cardinals who passed sentence upon Galileo did not speak for the Church, but only for the Inquisition—that the course of the three or four enlightened ecclesiastics who patronized Copernicus, does not prove that the Catholic spirit, in the sixteenth century, was favorable to scientific inquiry. Catholic writers are now very anxious to have it understood that Copernicus was a priest. How was it in 1616, when the Holy Office, with consent of the Pope, put his immortal work on the *Index Expurgatorius*? After insisting that Copernicus was the child of the Church, and that he was patronized rather than persecuted—after parading its dozen disciples of Copernicus, who lived unmolested, in the two generations following, *The World* says: "And yet we now reach a period when a professor of this same Copernican theory, in its home in Italy, was to be submitted to what are called the terrors of the Inquisition! Whence the change? How came it about?" To assume that there was, in any proper sense, a "change"—a change in the temper or spirit of the Roman hierarchy—is to assume the point in controversy, is to assume what the facts do not sustain. But it will be demanded of us, Why, then, did the Church not persecute Copernicus? To which we reply, first of all: that great man died within a few hours after the first copy of his published work was placed in his hands. But, it will be said, this is no sufficient answer, since Copernicus had held the theory undisturbed during the last forty years of his life. This difficulty is easily resolved when we study carefully the character of the two men, and the circumstances under which they advocated the heliocentric doctrine. Copernicus held the doctrine in retirement, living in a small Polish village; he withheld his book from publication long after his convictions were fully matured. The Cardinal Shomberg succeeded in getting the manuscript for the press, only after long and urgent entreaty; and when the work did finally appear, the preface clearly showed the fate the philosopher anticipated for it. To what conclusion do these facts point? To this, unmistakably: Nicholas Copernicus was a retiring scholar—a man of no

aggressive force—a champion not likely in such an age, or in any age, to give offense to Church or State. Even *The National Quarterly*, a semi-Roman publication, says: “Copernicus was one of those gentle souls who shrank from creating any commotion.” Galileo Galilei was a very different sort of man. His was a strong, a vaulting, an aggressive mind. He was not the man long to hold a sleeping truth; but the man to make the world ring with its advocacy. And then he lived in Italy, the home of the Pope, a center whence light could be radiated throughout Europe. The early history of the Protestant Reformation furnishes a complete parallel. It is not likely that the Roman Church would have paid much attention to Philip Melancthon, the elegant but timorous scholar, sitting in his study writing anti-Popish books; but Martin Luther, the bold preacher, thundering the same doctrines from his pulpit in Wittenburg, into the ears of the German people, this was a different thing. Now, Nicholas Copernicus and Galileo Galilei were respectively the Melancthon and the Luther of the new astronomy. The one observing the stars from the garret of his two-story house in Frauenburgh, and writing an immortal work in his study, which for thirty-six years he shrank from publishing, was a very different character from the other, lecturing and writing books in the great city of Florence.

But how do the Catholic apologists account for the change? Here they all have one answer. *The Catholic World* continues its questions: “Were there elements in the controversy other than scientific? And was it the fault of Galileo that the question was shifted from the safe repose of the scientific basis in which it had remained undisturbed more than fourscore years?” Both of these questions are answered in the affirmative. The writer in *The Catholic World* boldly says—and in this the other apologists agree with him—“Galileo was proceeded against by the Inquisition, not because he taught the Copernican astronomy, but because he attempted to defend it by making citations from the Scriptures.” Says our writer: “In vain Bellarmine cautioned him—‘It was essential that he should confine himself within his mathematical studies, if he wished to secure tranquillity for his labors.’ In vain Cardinal Barberini gave him the same advice. ‘Prove your system! Demonstrate it!’ they substantially say to Galileo; ‘and give yourself no concern about the Scriptures! The theologians will take care of them.’” Many Protestants

will be unable to see any pertinence in such an answer as this. Let us say then, once for all, 1. That the Catholic Church does not suffer a layman to expound the Scriptures—and Galileo was a layman; 2. That it does not allow any man to teach an interpretation contrary to that held by the Church. Granting that the answer made by the Catholic apologist is the true one, (a question we shall soon examine,) it is either satisfactory or worthless; it either exculpates the Church, or sinks it beneath the weight of a heavier condemnation. All depends upon the point of view occupied by him who passes judgment. The submissive Catholic will say, If Galileo contravened the canons of the Church, in either of the particulars named, he must suffer the consequences. The thinking Protestant will say, While it is a gross crime against humanity to punish a man for seeing that among the stars which Ptolemy did not see, it is a crime still grosser to punish him for expounding the Word of God. This is a line of argument we shall not follow. We simply say, if this position can be maintained, then the guilt of the Holy See in the controversy with Galileo is simply shifted to another ground. We shall now state all the material facts bearing upon the question.

As we have seen, the adherents of the old astronomy, who were the vast majority, were determined the new should not prevail if they could, by any means, prevent it. Their opposition was constant, strenuous, and virulent;* but they had the discernment to see that the only effectual power to array against Galileo was that of the Church. Excuse the Church as Catholic apologists may, on the ground of Galileo's violence and rashness, the fact remains, that the Church was willing to be used. Accordingly the outcries of the Ptolemaists were reëchoed by the priests. The astronomers said it was a sin to scoop out valleys in the fair face of the moon. The

*The men, whose habit it is to charge theologians with opposition to science, should note the fact that it was the philosophers who led the crusade upon Galileo. *The National Quarterly*, in an article on Copernicus, says: "Copernicus was aware, that, old as the Church was, even in his time, philosophers had been persecuted before it existed. He knew it was not the Church that had persecuted Socrates, and finally put him to death, but the populace. He was aware that it was not the Church that placed the life of Anaxagoras in jeopardy for having asserted that the moon was considerably larger, small as it looked in the heavens, than the whole of the Peloponnesus, and that if its centrifugal force ceased for a moment, it would fall to the earth like a stone from a sling." Such facts as these, too, teach a lesson.

ministers of religion said it was impious to send the world whirling through the regions of space. Both alike cried out (and apparently with equal violence) that the heliocentric doctrine was disproved by the Bible. Catholic apologists will have it that Galileo was condemned because he insisted on bringing the Scriptures into the controversy. Now, we bid the reader note a fact which these gentlemen do not tell us. *The enemies of Galileo were the first to make this appeal*; only when it had been bruited throughout Italy that his opinions were contrary to religion, did the astronomer reply. He wrote several letters, in the years 1613-14-15, upon the religious phase of the subject, in which he insisted, first and last, that the Scriptures ought not to be quoted to decide questions of experience and observation. From one of these letters, that addressed to the Grand Duchess of Tuscany, in 1615, we quote the following noble passages :

"I am inclined to believe that the intention of the Sacred Scriptures is to give mankind the information necessary for their salvation, and which, surpassing all human knowledge, can by no other means be accredited than by the mouth of the Holy Spirit. But I do not hold it necessary to believe that the same God who hath endowed us with sense, with speech, and with intellect, intended that we should neglect the use of these, and seek by other means the knowledge which they are sufficient to procure us ; especially in a science like astronomy, of which so little notice is taken in the Scriptures, that none of the planets, except the sun and moon, and once or twice only, Venus, under the name of Lucifer, are so much as mentioned there. This, therefore, being granted, I think that in the discussion of natural problems, we ought not to begin at the authority of texts of Scripture, but at sensible experiments and necessary demonstrations ; for from the Divine Word, Sacred Scripture and nature did both alike proceed ; and I conceive, that, concerning natural effects, that which either sensible experience sets before our eyes, or necessary demonstrations prove unto us, ought not, upon any account, to be called in question, much less condemned, upon the testimony of Scripture texts, which may, under their words, couch senses seemingly contrary thereto. . . . Again, to command the professors of Astronomy, that they, of themselves, should see to the confuting of their observations and demonstrations, is to enjoin a thing beyond all possibility of being done ; for it is not only to command them not to see that which they do see, and not to understand that which they do understand, but it is to order them to look for, and find, the contrary of that which they happen to meet with. I would entreat these wise and prudent fathers that they would, with all diligence, consider the difference which exists between opinionated and demonstrated doctrine, to the end that, well weighing in their own minds with what force necessary inferences urge us, they might the better assure themselves that it is not in the power of professors of demonstrative sciences to change their opinions at pleasure, and adopt first one side and then another ; and there is a

great difference between commanding a mathematician or philosopher, and the disposing of a lawyer or a merchant; and that the demonstrative conclusions touching the things of nature and of the heavens can not be changed with the same facility as the opinions of what is lawful or not, in a contract, bargain, or bill of exchange. Therefore, first let these men apply themselves to examine the arguments of Copernicus and others, and leave the condemning of them as erroneous and heretical, to whomever it belongs; yet let them not hope to find such rash and precipitate demonstrations in the judicious and holy fathers, or in the absolute wisdom of Him who can not err, as those into which they suffer themselves to be hurried by some particular interest or affection of their own. In these, and such other positions, which are not directly articles of faith, no man doubts but his Holiness has always an absolute power of admitting or condemning them; *but it is not in the power of any creature to make them to be true or false, otherwise than of their own nature and in fact they are.*"

This reasoning was unanswerable. Perhaps it was unwise in Galileo not to permit the matter to rest here. But, while he insisted thus strenuously that the Holy Word was not the arbiter in questions of science, he yet thought it proper, since his enemies had made the appeal, to show that his opinions did not antagonize with religion. In this he simply did what every logician does, who, denying the legitimacy of a given line of argument, yet undertakes to show that it would not sustain the conclusion, even if it were legitimate. Accordingly, in this letter to the Grand Duchess, as well as in others of the same kind, Galileo "undertook to prove theologically, and by reasons deduced from the Fathers, that the terms of Scripture might be reconciled with his new discoveries respecting the construction of the universe." For the first time Galileo now laid himself open to attack. Neither Church nor State had legislated against a man's studying or teaching astronomy; but the Church had legislated against a layman expounding the Scriptures, or against any one placing a construction upon them different from that which the Church received. The great astronomer had laid himself open to both these charges. A Protestant would say, verily, it was hard to prohibit Galileo from answering a word, while ignorant priests were permitted to range through the Bible at will, to find texts with which to confute his doctrine, and to bring him into disrepute; but with a Romanist, governed by the dicta of the Church, rather than by reason, touching such a question as this, it is idle to argue. The enemies of Galileo were swift to improve their advantage. Lorini, a Dominican monk, denounced him to the Inquisition at Rome. Caccini

went to Rome to embody the evidence against him, and also to denounce the great work of Copernicus. Having first obtained the consent of Cosmo, the Grand Duke of Tuscany, in December, 1615, Galileo went to Rome to counteract the machinations of his enemies. When he left that city a few months later, he had, at the bidding of the Inquisition, renounced the Copernican astronomy. Let us see how the thing was done.

At first, Galileo's denunciator was non-suited on a technicality. Cardinal Barberini advised the astronomer "not to travel out of the limits of physics and mathematics, but to confine himself to such reasonings as Ptolemy and Copernicus used; because, declaring the views of Scripture, the theologians maintained to be their particular province." If it were not an idle curiosity, we would like to know whether the Cardinal gave the same advice to the insulting rabble of priests and Ptolemaists who dogged the heels of the great Florentine! But the matter was brought before the Pope and the Cardinals again. This was done by Cardinal Orsini, Galileo's own firm friend, whose object was to obtain from the authorities some recognition of the new astronomy. To say the least, Orsini should have known better. The Pope now declared he would send the matter before the Inquisition. He immediately referred the matter to eleven consulting theologians, who reported February 24, 1616. The pith of this report is found in the following words:

"To maintain that the sun is placed immovably in the center of the world (universe) is an opinion absurd in itself, false in philosophy, and formally heretical, *because it is directly contrary to the Scriptures*; to maintain that the earth is not placed in the center of the world (universe), that it is not immovable, and that it has even a daily motion or rotation, is also an absurd proposition, false in philosophy, and, *at least, erroneous in point of faith.*"

The business now proceeded with dispatch. On the 25th of February, by virtue of an order written by the Pope himself, Galileo was summoned the next day to the palace of the Inquisition. On the 26th, he stood in the presence of Cardinal Bellarmine, to hear the final decree of the Holy Office. The events of these two days are thus summed up by Sir David Brewster:

"The Inquisition assembled to consider these charges on the 25th of February, 1616; and it was decreed that Galileo should be enjoined by Cardinal Bellarmine to renounce the obnoxious doctrines, and to pledge himself that he would neither

teach, defend, nor publish them in future. In the event of his refusal to acquiesce in this sentence, it was decreed that he should be thrown into prison. Galileo did not hesitate to yield to this injunction. On the following day, the 26th of February, he appeared before Cardinal Bellarmine to renounce his heretical opinions; and having declared that he abandoned the doctrine of the earth's motion, and would neither defend nor teach it in his conversations or in his writings, he was dismissed from the court."

If we may be permitted to quote a sentence from another article, "this is the pass to which we come when the Church, forgetting her own divinely appointed mission, presumes to pronounce authoritatively on scientific questions."

While it omits some important facts stated in the above extract from Sir David Brewster, *The Catholic World* is yet constrained to say: "Galileo was enjoined by the decree to abandon the opinion of terrestrial motion, and neither to teach nor treat of it." But the Holy Office did not pause here. On the 4th of March the work of Foscarini, a Carmelite friar and professor of philosophy, (an exposition of the heliocentric doctrine,) was condemned, which proves, according to good Catholic authority, that Galileo was not discriminated against "merely because he was a layman." Foscarini's work, Galileo's letters, Kepler's epitome of the Copernican doctrine, and Copernicus's *De Revolutionibus*, were all put in the list of prohibited books.* Catholic writers now plume themselves upon the fact that

*These works were taken from the Index of prohibited books by Pope Benedict XIV in 1835. A vigorous pamphleteer says: "Since that time, I suppose, the Roman Church allows the earth to turn on its axis and to revolve around the sun." We deem it proper to give a brief account of the Congregation of the Index.

The Inquisition, called by Pope Paul IV "the sheet-anchor of the Papacy," took rank, as a regular constituted institution of religion, in 1215—the very year that the great English Charter was granted. St. Dominic was, probably, its originator. At least, it was early put under the control of the Dominican Order. Among its most ingenious and successful inventions for the suppression of free thought must be placed the two Indexes. The *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* is a catalogue of books which the Roman Church absolutely forbids the body of its communicants to read. The *Index Librorum Expurgatorum*, commonly called the *Index Expurgatorius*, is a catalogue of books proscribed until such passages as are obnoxious to the Church are expunged. These Indexes are prepared by eleven cardinals and theologians at Rome, called the Congregation of the Index. Few, even of those well read in history, have little conception of the immense influence this Congregation has exerted. In 1543, the very year in which Copernicus's work was published, Cardinal Caraffa decreed that "no book whatever, whether new or old, and whatever its contents, should for the future be printed without permission from the Inquisition." We shall meet this decree again before we are done with our story. Speaking of the *Index*, Paul Sarpi wrote: "Never will a more effectual means be discovered of making dunces of men under the pretense of making them more pious." Before dismissing this subject we quote two paragraphs from Hallam:

"But Rome struck a fatal blow, and perhaps more deadly than she intended, at literature

the father of the received system of astronomy was a Catholic and a priest; let them not forget that, in 1616, the high authorities at Rome set upon his great work the seal of condemnation.

Interrupting here the course of our narrative, we have several questions to propound: If the intention was to punish Galileo simply for meddling with the Scriptures, why did not the Inquisition so state in express terms in its decree? Why did it not content itself with condemning Galileo in that wherein he had offended? Why did the eleven consulting theologians pronounce the proposition that the earth revolves "absurd," "false in philosophy, and, at least, erroneous in point of faith?" Why did the Holy Office enjoin Galileo "to renounce the obnoxious doctrines, and to pledge himself that he would neither teach, defend, nor publish them in future?" Why did it resolve to throw him into prison unless he should make such a pledge? Why did it interdict the epitome of Kepler? and, above all, the great work of the beloved priest, Copernicus? While we are not in the habit of dealing in defiance, we do here, on this broad page,

in the *Index Expurgatorius* of prohibited books. It had long been the regulation that no book should be printed without a previous license. This was, of course, a restraint on the freedom of writing, but it was less injurious to the trade of the printer and book-seller than the subsequent prohibition of what he had published or purchased at his own cost or risk. The first list of books prohibited by the Church was set forth by Paul IV, in 1559. His Index included all Bibles in modern languages, enumerating forty-eight editions, chiefly printed in countries still within the obedience of the Church. Sixty-one printers are put under a general ban, all works of every description from their presses being forbidden. Stephens and Oporinus have the honor of being among these. This system was pursued and rigorously acted upon by the successors of the imperious Caraffa. The Council of Trent had its own list of condemned publications. Philip II has been said to have preceded the Pope himself in a similar proscription. Wherever the sway of Rome and Spain was felt, books were unsparingly burned, and to this cause is imputed the scarcity of many editions.

"In its principle, which was apparently that of preserving obedience, the prohibitory system might seem to have left untouched many great walks of learning and science. It is, of course, manifest that it fell with but an oblique blow upon common literature. Yet, as a few words or sentences were sufficient to elicit a sentence of condemnation, often issued with little reflection, it was difficult for any author to be fully secure; and this inspired so much apprehension into printers, that they became unwilling to incur hazard of an obnoxious trade. These occupations, says Galluzzi, which had begun to prosper at Florence, never recovered the wound inflicted by the severe regulations of Paul IV and Pius V. The art retired to Switzerland and Germany. The book-sellers were at the mercy of the Inquisition, which every day contrived new methods of harassing them. From an interdiction of the sale of certain prohibited books, the Church proceeded to forbid that of all which were not expressly permitted. The Guinti, a firm not so eminent as it had been in the early part of the century, but still the honor of Florence, remonstrated in vain. It seems probable, however, that after the death of Pius V. the most rigorous and bigoted Pontiff that ever filled the chair, some degree of relaxation took place."—*Harper's edition*, vol. I, p. 413.

challenge any and all Catholics, from Rome to the uttermost parts of the earth, to answer these questions in any way that shall save their beloved hypothesis; which hypothesis, we do not hesitate to say, is made to order—wholly an afterthought, an attempt at whitewashing; an hypothesis that is really more discreditable to the Roman Church than the crime with which she has so long stood charged. The real intention of the Church was, at the time, perfectly well understood. We quote again from Hallam:

"The Church was not mistaken in supposing that she should intimidate the Copernicans, but very much so in expecting to suppress the theory. Descartes was so astonished at hearing of the sentence on Galileo, that he was almost disposed to burn his papers, or, at least, to let no one see them. 'I can not collect,' he says, 'that he who is an Italian, and friend of the Pope, as I understand, has been criminated on any other account than for having attempted to establish the motion of the earth. I know that this opinion was formerly censured by some cardinals; but I thought I had since heard that no objection was now made to its being publicly taught even at Rome.' It seems not at all unlikely that Descartes was induced, on this account, to pretend to a greater degree of difference from Copernicus than he really felt, and even to deny, in a certain sense of his own, the obnoxious tenet of the earth's motion. He was not without danger of a sentence against truth nearer at hand—Cardinal Richelieu having had the intention of procuring a decree of the Sorbonne to the same effect, which, by the good sense of some of that society, fell to the ground."*

Hallam does not make it entirely clear whether Descartes wrote of the decree of 1616 or that of 1633. Probably it was the latter; but does not matter so far as its value, touching the question at issue, is concerned. Blaise Pascal, a most pious Catholic, as well as a miracle of genius, belongs to the next generation. He did not hesitate to charge the condemnation of Galileo upon the Jesuits. In the eighteenth Provincial Letter, dated March 24, 1657, he wrote these stinging words:

"It was to equally little purpose that you obtain against Galileo a decree from Rome, condemning his opinion respecting the motion of the earth. It will never be proved by such an argument as this that the earth remains stationary; and if it can be demonstrated, by sound observation, that it is the earth and not the sun that revolves, the efforts and arguments of all mankind put together will not hinder our planet from revolving, nor themselves from revolving with her."

When all was over, Galileo had an audience with the Pope, who received him very graciously, and gave him every assurance of good-will

* "Literature of Europe." Harper's edition, vol. II, p. 249.

and friendship. What had been done at Rome was not generally understood in other than a general way. The enemies of Galileo circulated the report that the Congregation of the Index had condemned him, and that he had abjured his opinions. That the astronomer might be able to refute these calumnies, on the 26th of May, Cardinal Bellarmine gave him a writing setting forth that a "communication was made to him of a declaration of His Holiness," "from the tenor of which it results, that 'the doctrine attributed to Copernicus, as to the pretended movement of the earth around the sun, and as to the place which the sun occupies in the center of the world, without moving from its rising to its setting, is opposed to the Holy Scriptures, and, consequently, may not be defended or held.'" With the delivery of this document, the first act of "the moving drama" closes, and the curtain falls. Before the curtain again rises, we have a remark to make touching the position and the conduct of Cardinal Bellarmine. *The Catholic World* states that there is the most "overwhelming testimony, that he never questioned the truth of Galileo's doctrine, but only his imprudent manner of propounding it." We know nothing of this testimony; but this we do know, if there is such testimony, then the grand Cardinal was guilty of the grossest self-stultification. He "never questioned the truth of Galileo's doctrine," and yet he was the Pope's mouth-piece in declaring that this doctrine "is opposed to the Holy Scriptures, and, consequently, may not be defended or held." Unless the *World* has done him the greatest injustice, the Commissary of the Holy Office was guilty of "holding," what, according to the decree of his own tribunal, might not be "held," because opposed to the Holy Scriptures!

Returning to Florence, Galileo gave himself, with his usual ardor, to scientific studies. In 1618 his health failed. He wrote several philosophical works, but, as they add nothing to his fame, and do not bear upon the question we are now chiefly interested in, we shall not so much as give their titles. In 1623 Cardinal Barberini was elected Pope. Henceforth we shall know him as Urban VIII. His election was hailed by scientific men with enthusiasm. We are told that Galileo hailed it with exultation. He had opposed the decree of 1616, and had subsequently treated Galileo with much kindness. He immediately wrote a letter to the Grand Duke of

Tuscany, felicitating him on the glory redounding to Etruria, by reason of the philosopher's genius and discoveries. But the *man Barberini* was soon swallowed up in the *Pope Urban*.

In 1624 Galileo made a third visit to Rome. According to his own story, he was kindly received. He had six audiences with the Pope, who treated him with great consideration. He was the recipient of many presents; among others, a pension of one hundred crowns yearly, while another of sixty crowns was promised his son. But he was not long learning, however, that the Church had no intention of revoking its decree. The current of feeling at Rome was, that the facts of science should not be so stated as to militate against the Scriptures. The more intelligent ecclesiastics were, evidently, desirous of avoiding troublesome complications. An extract of a letter written by Galileo on the 8th of June, shows this: "With regard to deciding on what side the truth lies, Father Mostro adheres neither to the Copernican nor the Ptolemaic system, but satisfies himself with a system of his own, which is a very convenient one; it is, that angels, who trouble nobody, move the stars as they like, and that we have nothing further to see in them." A "convenient" system, surely!

As the Catholic apologists lay much stress on the fact that, on different occasions, Galileo was treated with great kindness by the authorities at Rome, we must give it some attention. What does the fact determine as to the position of the Pope and his advisers, with reference to the new astronomy? Since the eleven consulting theologians had pronounced Galileo's doctrine false, absurd, and heretical; since the Congregation of the Index, at the bidding of Paul V, had declared that doctrine "opposed to the Holy Scriptures"—a doctrine that might not be "defended" or "held"—and had exacted from Galileo a promise that he would wholly abandon it; and, since it was in the power of the Inquisition to enforce this decree by pains and penalties; in view of all these unquestioned facts, we fail to see that the granting of an audience, in which said Paul V gave the philosopher assurance of good-will and friendship, is a very material consideration. What astonishes us in this transaction is, not that the Pope was willing to grant, but that Galileo was willing to accept, an audience. A man of loftiest soul, under such circumstances, would have refused to listen to the Pope's assurance. The

only excuse that we can frame for him is this: Galileo was a Catholic. From his birth he had breathed the air of Italy, poisoned with political and religious servility. His fault was the fault of the age, or rather of that type of religion which invests a man with the divine attributes. The transaction of 1624 must be viewed somewhat differently. Urban had not dictated the decree of 1616, but, as a cardinal, had opposed it; personally he was Galileo's friend. To accept his gifts was less degrading than to accept Paul's assurances. But Galileo would now appear to vastly better advantage on the historic page, if, asserting a manly independence, he had refused them.

But Galileo's manhood, we grieve to say, rests under still more damaging imputations. There is, however, another point of view, from which these Pontifical courtesies may be considered. The functionaries at Rome were anxious to have Galileo keep quiet. The public mind was becoming unsettled with reference to the patristic astronomy. Galileo wielded a power that the hierarchy feared. The hierarchy was strong, the philosopher weak; the hierarchy could crush the philosopher at any moment, but the philosopher, if he became exasperated, might do infinite mischief. Like Sampson, he might triumph in his death. Mother Church is quite like some other mothers, who brandish the rod with one hand, and hold out confectionery in the other. Accordingly, Galileo was punished and pensioned. This hypothesis is confirmed by the fact that, in 1633, Urban felt personally aggrieved at Galileo's course. He impliedly charged him with ingratitude, saying: "Signor Galileo has been my friend; we have several times conversed familiarly together, and ate at the same table."

We may well suppose that Galileo continually chafed under the restraints laid upon him. He is said to have had "connection with a political party, unfriendly to religion as well as to the Papal government"—a party called, by *The North British Review*, "the band of skeptics that hounded him on to his ruin." Sad fact, that the foremost man of science that graced the age should have been driven, by the ignorant illiberality of the Church, to affiliate with skeptics! Although the astronomer was constantly restive, he did not, until half a generation had passed, violate his parole. But violate it at length he did, and the violation, its antecedents and

consequents, is the second act of the "moving drama." Again the curtain rises.

So early as 1630, Galileo had completed a work, entitled "The System of the World of Galileo Galilei," in which he undertook to demonstrate, not openly and directly, but covertly and hypothetically, the Copernican system. This work consisted of four dialogues concerning the two principal systems of the world. *The North British Review* describes it thus :

"It is dedicated to his patron, Ferdinand, Grand Duke of Tuscany, and is prefaced by an 'Address to the Prudent Reader,' which is itself any thing but prudent. He refers to the decree of the Inquisition in the most insulting and ironical language. By insinuations ascribed to others, he attributes the decree to ignorance and to passion ; and he pretends to demonstrate the Copernican system purely as a mathematical hypothesis, and not as an opinion absolutely more sound than that of Ptolemy. Of the three persons by whom the dialogue is carried on, Salviati is the true philosopher and principal speaker in the dialogue. Sagredo, the name of another friend of the author, proposes doubts, suggests difficulties, and enlivens with his wit the gravity of the dialogue. Simplicio, a stanch Peripatetic and follower of Ptolemy, modestly pleads the cause of the Ptolemaic system, but is baffled on every point by the philosophy and wit of his friends."

It was easy for Galileo to write such a book as this, but to publish it was a more difficult matter. According to the standing rule of the Inquisition, no book could be published in Italy (at least not in some of the States, and Tuscany was one of these) without a permission from the functionary known at Rome as the Master of the Sacred Palace, who acted as censor of new publications. Fortunately, or unfortunately, this functionary had been a pupil of Galileo. License to print was finally obtained, but the manner in which it was obtained, to say the least, raises the question whether the astronomer acted in good faith. In 1632 the work was published at Florence. Those mathematicians and astronomers who were not hopelessly wedded to the old system, received it with loud acclaims, but the exploding of a powder magazine under the Vatican could not have created a more profound sensation at Rome. The Inquisition promptly prohibited the circulation of the copies that had been sent to Rome, and the opinion universally prevailed that the daring author would be summarily punished ; and so, in time, he was. Pausing here, in our narrative, we must pay some attention to one or two subordinate questions.

To account for the publication of this work has occasioned much

perplexity. Did Galileo imagine that the Church had forgotten the decree of 1616? Did he imagine that the Inquisition slept? Did he suppose that it would suffer him to brave its authority? Had the gifts of Urban led him to the conclusion that there had been a change in the Pontifical policy? It is impossible to find satisfactory answers to these questions. If Galileo answered them affirmatively, he most certainly counted without his host. Sir David Brewster seeks to account for the publication by supposing, that, notwithstanding that Galileo "made a narrow escape from the grasp of the Inquisition, he was never sufficiently sensible of the lenity which he experienced;" that is to say, the philosopher did not appreciate the gravity of the occasion. We should rather seek to solve the problem, though with much diffidence, by supposing that the volcanic forces of a nature that had been most cruelly outraged by bigoted philosophers and ignorant priests, could no longer be repressed. But whatever hypothesis may be resorted to, it is impossible to defend Galileo. If he had maintained a sturdy independence, then he would have been free to speak or to keep silent; that were a question between him and God. But he had promised neither to defend nor to hold the Copernican system; besides, he had hopelessly compromised himself by accepting the donatives of Urban. He was under bonds to keep the peace. But we must remember that other great men, both before and since, have been guilty of similar weakness and folly. Galileo's sad fate should serve as a warning to others. He who intends to defy high political or ecclesiastical functionaries should take heed how he becomes a pensioner upon their bounty. Nor does Galileo seem to have been wholly straightforward in obtaining the license from the censor. That officer did not attend to his business very thoroughly, and it is not certain that the philosopher acted in bad faith. In either case it is well to remember that oppressive legislation is not calculated to develop straightforwardness. Either political or ecclesiastical inquisitors drive even good men into indiscretions and moral obliquities for which the moral sense of mankind refuses to hold them responsible. According to the laws of Great Britain, John Hancock was a smuggler.

Whatever may have been Galileo's thoughts previous to the publication of his dialogues, they were no sooner published than he saw himself in the face of imminent danger. He implored the

protection of the Grand Duke, who did his utmost to shield him. Attempts were made to propitiate the Pope, but his Holiness insisted that the majesty of the law must be vindicated. In the month of September, 1632, Galileo was cited to repair to Rome and present himself to the Commissary of the Holy Office. He was now nearly seventy years old, and very infirm. When the Tuscan ambassador pleaded those facts, as a reason why the citation should not be enforced, the Pope said: "Let him come slowly, in a litter, and quite at his ease, but it is absolutely necessary that he should be examined in person, and may God forgive him for having got into such difficulties, after I, when Cardinal, had, on a former occasion, extricated him." On the 13th of February, 1633, the great Florentine arrived in Rome, and was lodged in the house of the Tuscan ambassador.

The principal count in the indictment against Galileo was, that he had broken the decree of 1616. The story of the trial is a long one, and we have neither the space nor the disposition to recount it in detail. The official records have never yet been fully published in any modern language. If the extracts that have come to our knowledge do justice to the whole, and, still further, if the official records do justice to the truth, then Galileo did not appear to good advantage before the Inquisition. He was not the man of lofty independence, of commanding manhood, that we have loved to picture him; but he was the man of broken, timorous spirit, who resorted to quibbles and apparent equivocation. At length the trial ended, and a sentence was framed. On the 21st of June, Galileo was summoned to the Holy Office, where he was kept over the following day. On the 23d he was taken to the Church of Minerva, where the decree was read to him, and where, on his knees, clothed in a penitential garment, in the presence of the cardinals and the prelates of the Congregation of the Index, he abjured that beautiful system of astronomy of which he continues to be one of the greatest expounders. The decree of the Congregation is a lengthy document, but as it is rare, and as it corroborates our view of the trial of 1616, we give it entire. Here it follows, as copied from the broad page of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*:

"We, the undersigned, by the grace of God, Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, Inquisitors General throughout the whole Christian Republic, Special Deputies of the Holy Apostolical Chair against heretical Depravity: Whereas,

you, Galileo, son of the late Vincenzo Galilei, of Florence, aged seventy years, were denounced, in 1615, to this Holy Office, for holding as true a false doctrine taught by many, namely, that the sun is immovable in the center of the world, and that the earth moves, and also with a diurnal motion; also, for having pupils whom you instructed in the same opinions; also, for maintaining a correspondence on the same with some German mathematicians; also, for publishing certain letters on the solar spots, in which you developed the same doctrine as true; also, for answering the objections which were continually produced from the Holy Scriptures, by glozing the said Scriptures according to your own meaning; and, whereas, thereupon was produced the copy of a writing, in form of a letter, professedly written by you to a person, formerly your pupil, in which, following the hypothesis of Copernicus, you include several propositions contrary to the true sense and authority of the Holy Scriptures; therefore, this holy tribunal, being desirous of providing against the disorder and mischief which was thence proceeding and increasing, to the detriment of the holy faith, by the desire of His Holiness, and the most eminent Lords Cardinals of this supreme and universal Inquisition, the two propositions of the stability of the sun, and motion of the earth, were *qualified* by the *theological* *qualifiers* as follows: 1. *The proposition that the sun is in the center of the world, and immovable from its place, is absurd, philosophically false, and formally heretical, because it is expressly contrary to the Holy Scripture.* 2. *The proposition that the earth is not the center of the world, nor immovable, but that it moves, and also with a diurnal motion, is also absurd, philosophically false, and, theologically considered, at least erroneous in faith.* But, whereas, being pleased at that time to deal mildly with you, it was decreed in the holy *Congregation*, held before His Holiness on the 25th day of February, 1616, that his eminence, the Lord Cardinal Bellarmine, should enjoin you to give up altogether the said false doctrine; if you should refuse, that you should be ordered by the Commissary of the Holy Office to relinquish it, not to teach it to others, nor to defend it, nor ever mention it, and in default of acquiescence that you should be imprisoned; and, in execution of this decree, on the following day, at the palace, in presence of his eminence, the said Lord Cardinal Bellarmine, after you had been mildly admonished by the said Lord Cardinal, you were commanded by the acting Commissary of the Holy Office, before a notary and witnesses, to relinquish altogether the said false opinion, and in future neither to defend nor teach it in any manner, neither verbally nor in writing; and, upon your promising obedience, you were dismissed. And in order that so pernicious a doctrine might be altogether rooted out, nor insinuate itself further to the heavy detriment of the Catholic truth, a decree emanated from the holy Congregation of the Index prohibiting the books which treat of this doctrine; and it was declared false, and altogether contrary to the Holy and Divine Scripture. And, whereas, a book has since appeared, published at Florence, last year, the title of which showed that you were the author, which title is, *The Dialogue of Galileo Galilei, on the two principal systems of the world, the Ptolemaic and Copernican*; and, whereas, the holy Congregation has heard that, in consequence of the printing of the said book, the false opinion of the earth's motion and stability of the sun is daily gaining ground, the said book has been taken into careful consideration, and in it has been detected a glaring violation of the said order, which had been intimated to you; inasmuch as in this book you have defended the said opinion, already and in your presence condemned; although in the said book you

labor with many circumlocutions to induce the belief that it is left by you undecided, and in express terms probable; which is equally a very grave error, since an opinion can in no way be probable which has been already declared, and finally determined contrary to the Divine Scripture. Therefore, by our order, you have been cited to this Holy Office, where, on your examination upon oath, you have acknowledged the said book as written and printed by you. You also confessed that you began to write the said book ten or twelve years ago, after the order aforesaid had been given; also, that you demanded license to publish it, but without signifying to those who granted you this permission, that you had been commanded not to hold, defend, or teach the said doctrine in any manner. You also confess that the style of the said book was, in many places, so composed that the reader might think the arguments adduced on the false side, to be so worded as more effectually to entangle the understanding, than to be easily solved; alleging, in excuse, that you have thus run into an error, foreign (as you say) to your intention, from writing in the form of a dialogue, and in consequence of the natural complacency which every one feels with regard to his own subtilties, and in showing himself more skillful than the generality of mankind, in contriving, even in favor of false propositions, ingenious and apparently probable arguments; and, upon a convenient time being given to you for making your defense, you produced a certificate in the handwriting of his eminence, the Lord Cardinal Bellarmine, procured, as you said, by yourself, that you might defend yourself against the calumnies of your enemies, who reported that you had abjured your opinions, and had been punished by the Holy Office; in which certificate it is declared that you had not abjured, nor had been punished, but merely that the declaration made by His Holiness, and promulgated by the holy Congregation of the Index, had been announced to you, which declares that the opinion of the motion of the earth and stability of the sun, is contrary to the Holy Scriptures, and, therefore, can not be held or defended. Wherefore, since no mention is there made of two articles of the order, to-wit, the order 'not to teach,' and 'in any manner,' you argue that we ought to believe that, in the lapse of fourteen or sixteen years, they had escaped your memory, and that this was also the reason why you were silent as to the order when you sought permission to publish your book, and that this is said by you not to excuse your error, but that it may be attributed to vainglorious ambition, rather than to malice. But this very certificate, produced on your behalf, has greatly aggravated your offense, since it is therein declared that the said opinion was contrary to the Holy Scriptures; and yet you have dared to treat of it, to defend it, and to argue that it is probable, nor is there any extenuation in the license artfully and cunningly extorted by you, since you did not intimate the command imposed upon you; but, whereas, it appeared to us that you had not disclosed the whole truth with regard to your intentions, we thought it necessary to proceed to the rigorous examination of you, in which (without any prejudice to what you had confessed, and which is above detailed against you, with regard to your said intention) you answered like a good Catholic. Therefore, having seen and maturely considered the merits of your cause, with your said confessions and excuses, and every thing else which ought to be seen and considered, we have come to the under-written final sentence against you. Invoking, therefore, the most holy name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of his most glorious Virgin Mother Mary, by this our final sentence, which, sitting in council and judgment for the Tribunal of the Reverend Masters of Sacred Theology,

and Doctors of both Laws, our assessors, we put forth in this writing, touching the matters and controversies before us, between the magnificent Charles Sincerus, Doctor of both Laws, Fiscal Proctor of this Holy Office, of the one part, and you, Galileo Galilei, an examined and confessed criminal from this present writing now in progress as above, of the other part; we pronounce, judge, and declare, that you, the said Galileo, by reason of these things which have been detailed in the course of this writing, and which, as above, you have confessed, have rendered yourself vehemently suspected by this Holy Office of heresy, that is to say, that you believe and hold the false doctrine, and contrary to the Holy and Divine Scriptures, namely: that the sun is the center of the world, and that it does not move from east to west, and that the earth does not move, and is not the center of the world; also, that an opinion can be held and supported as probable after it has been declared and finally decreed contrary to the Holy Scripture, and, consequently, that you have incurred all the censures and penalties enjoined and promulgated in the sacred canons, and other general and particular constitutions against delinquents of this description; from which it is our pleasure that you be absolved, provided that, first, with a sincere heart and unfeigned faith, in our presence, you abjure, curse, and detest the said errors and heresies, and every other error and heresy contrary to the Catholic and Apostolic Church of Rome, in the form now shown to you. But, that your grievous and pernicious error and transgression may not go altogether unpunished, and that you may be made more cautious in future, and may be a warning to others to abstain from delinquencies of this sort, we decree that the book of the Dialogues of Galileo Galilei be prohibited by a public edict, and we condemn you to the formal prison of this Holy Office, for a period determinable at our pleasure, and, by way of salutary penance, we order you, during the next three years, to recite once a week the seven penitential psalms, reserving to ourselves the power of moderating, commuting, or taking off the whole or part of the said punishment and penance. And so we say, pronounce, and by our sentence decree, and reserve, in this and in every other better form and manner, which lawfully we may and can use. So we, the subscribing Cardinals, pronounce.

FELIX, CARDINAL DI ASCOLI,

DESIDERIO, CARDINAL DI CREMONA,

BERLINGERO, CARDINAL GESSI,

MARTINO, CARDINAL GINETTI."

GUIDO, CARDINAL BENTIVOGLIO,

ANTONIA, CARDINAL S. ONOFRIO,

FABRICIO, CARDINAL VEROSPI,

This decree, of itself, disposes of the plea that Galileo was punished as a theologian and not as an astronomer. *The Catholic World* finds it an onerous task to harmonize it with its theory. After quoting some of the more obnoxious portions, it says: "Let the advocates of the old version of the Galileo story make the most of it;" words that are evidently prompted by its despair, and not by its confidence.

Some of the claims made by Catholic apologists must be allowed:

1. Considering the fact that Galileo was a prisoner of the Inquisition, he was treated with great lenity by the authorities at Rome;

2. He was not tortured, as was formally held—the expression “*esame rogorosa*,” or “rigorous examination,” found in the decree, being susceptible of another meaning; 3. The astronomer did not say as he rose from his knees, “It moves though;” 4. The Pope immediately commuted the sentence of imprisonment. But these further facts are also indisputable: 1. Galileo would have been treated with much greater severity had it not been for the persistent intercession of the Grand Duke of Tuscany in his behalf;* 2. The sentence of imprisonment was never revoked, so that he might, at any time, be immured in a dungeon without further trial; 3. To the day of his death the philosopher was kept in limited confinement, sometimes in his own house; 4. His friends at Florence and Rome were treated with the most insulting indignities. We shall have occasion to speak of other evidences of malignity, when we come to the close of this great and checkered career.

The time has now come to pay some attention to the four articles contributed by M. Biot to the *Journal des Savants*. The length of this article precludes a very full consideration of the peculiar theory set forth in them. Happily, such consideration is not necessary.

M. Biot states, that being in Rome, in 1825, he had an interview with the Commissary of the Holy Office, (the personage commonly known as the Grand Inquisitor,) who told him that Galileo was tried and condemned in 1633, because he had ridiculed the Pope in his dialogues. The charge was, that the peripatetic “Simplicio” was no less a personage than Urban VIII. This was an old story, but new to M. Biot, who seems to have believed it most implicitly. After waiting thirty-three years, he published it to the world. It is used by all the apologists whom we have consulted.

Now, we confess, that when we first saw this theory put forth by good Catholics, we were greatly amazed. His Holiness, the Pope, crushing a defenseless astronomer on account of a personal grievance, and at the same time telling the world that he did it for an entirely different reason! In a Protestant this would have been called a slander. As we read we found ourselves groping for the long-forgotten words of Virgil: “*Tantaene animis coelestibus irae?*”

* Urban himself said to the Tuscan ambassador that, out of respect to this sovereign, he had treated the philosopher with “unusual gentleness and clemency in permitting him to remain at the embassy, instead of transferring him to the Inquisition.”

"Is there so great anger in celestial minds?" The theory itself has been repeatedly exploded. *The North British Review* effectually disposed of it in an article entitled "The Martyrdom of Galileo," published in November, 1860. The writer conclusively showed: 1. That Simplicio was not Urban; 2. That Urban could not have felt aggrieved even if he had furnished the original of that character; 3. That no other theory is necessary to explain the Pope's action than the one which lies on the very surface, namely: Galileo had defied ecclesiastical authority, and that authority must be vindicated by punishing him. M. Biot's theory, which is also resorted to by the *World*, merits at our hands no further consideration.

The Catholic World has introduced another question into the discussion. It affirms that Galileo did not demonstrate the Copernican system—that that system was not susceptible of demonstration in his age. These are its words:

"If Galileo did determine the problem of the moving of the earth, *there is no excuse for Rome!* But, a candid examination of the condition of astronomical science at that period, and of the extent of Galileo's acquisitions, will show that not only was the system not demonstrated by Galileo, but that, with the entire fund of astronomical and physical knowledge in his day, it was not then susceptible of demonstration by him or by any one else. . . . Only the combined genius and ceaseless toil of the illustrious men of science of all Christendom barely succeeded in accomplishing the demonstration of which we speak, nearly two centuries after the grave had closed over Galileo and his judges."

To omit to state these facts is styled leaving "totally out of view one capital feature" of the discussion. Now, we are quite at a loss to imagine what discoveries were made at the time referred to, that settled the question of the earth's rotation. We opine that it would puzzle our men of science to name them. But, the *World* subsequently modifies its dictum, and says the system is not established yet! Now, we freely admit that Galileo's scientific attainments are a proper subject of investigation, but we fail to see their relevancy to the main question. The point of the argument is, that the Congregation of the Index did not sin against light and knowledge in condemning Galileo, because he had not proved his doctrine. The reader must note the admission that "if Galileo determined the problem of the movement of the earth, *there is no excuse for Rome.*" This implies that as he did *not* determine that problem, Rome is excusable. But it would appear to one who simply follows the

leadings of common sense, that if the Florentine had a right to determine it, he had a right to attempt to determine it, and if the Church is "without excuse" for dragging him before the Inquisition provided he succeeded, it is also without excuse provided he partially failed. The right to succeed involves the right to fail. Reduced to its simplest form, the *World's* thesis is this: the Church may lay violent hands on the philosopher who sets up a scientific doctrine in opposition to her interpretation of the Bible, provided he fails to establish it; but if he establish it, then she may not touch him. Then it would appear to the man of simple common sense that, if the Church had the right to interfere with Galileo for meddling with the Scriptures in the one case, she had equally the same right in the other. The truth is, she had no right in either; but the soundness or unsoundness of a scientific doctrine can not be allowed to interfere with the question of authority. If the astronomers had all lived in Italy, and if they had all withheld their speculation until they were able to demonstrate the heliocentric astronomy to the satisfaction of the Inquisition, the mass of Christians would be Ptolemaists still.

But *The Catholic World* is not content to defend its own communion against the charge of persecuting science; it seeks to turn the tables upon Protestants. Tycho Brahe was persecuted in Denmark, Kepler and Descartes in Holland, both Protestant countries. Other of the high priests of science have been persecuted by Protestants. These charges are all true, and he who does not admit them has no right to accuse Rome. We fail to see that, when the merits of the two astronomies were being canvassed in the seventeenth century, Protestants were more pervious to the light than Romanists. The ecclesiastical spirit is not Christ's spirit. In the Christian system, God is the God of Truth; Christ is the Truth; men are made "free" by the Truth; the Comforter is the Spirit of Truth; the disciple is of the Truth. Dogmatic systems are something very different. The simple theologian or ecclesiastic lives in a close atmosphere; his thoughts are upon dogmas and ecclesiastical regulations; he is not liberalized by a large knowledge of men and of the world; he knows little of those invigorating studies that lead to largeness of view. Here the difference between the average Catholic doctor and the average Protestant doctor is one of degree merely. The system of the former has much more of dogma and ecclesiasticism, and he is,

accordingly, much less liberal, much less tolerant. The Protestant principle is favorable to freedom of thought; but there are too many Protestants whose spirit and temper are such as the repressive Roman system nourishes. It was as inexcusable in the Calvinists to burn Servetus for denying the doctrine of the Trinity, as it was in the Catholics to burn Bruno for denying the doctrine of Transubstantiation; as inexcusable in the Hollanders to molest Kepler, as in the Italians to persecute Galileo. God forbid that we should excuse a Protestant when we would condemn a Catholic! But we can not shut our eyes to the different tendencies of the two systems; besides, it is worth remarking, that modern judges are frequently unjust to these ancient sinners. Their faults were commonly the faults of the age in which they lived. It was the sixteenth century that burned Servetus, rather than Calvin and his co-religionists. In this foul deed we see what humanity was capable of in an age when the conception of what Roger Williams called "soul freedom" had not dawned upon the human mind. Gladly would we throw the same mantle over the crimes committed by the Roman Church if we had opportunity; but the dogma of infallibility intervenes, and compels us to hold those who committed them responsible.

Let us not be misunderstood. We understand the best Catholic authorities to hold theoretically the dogma of infallibility thus: *The concurrent voice of the Church, expressed by Council and by Pope conjointly, is infallible.* Hence, it may be argued, that as the Church concurrently did not condemn Galileo, therefore, the Church is not responsible. But to what does the dogma practically lead? A whole is equal to the sum of its parts. Fallible individuals can not form an infallible Council or an infallible Church. Hence, if a logical mind holds a body of men infallible, it will practically regard the individuals who compose it as not liable to error. Accordingly, those Catholics who desire the next Council to declare the Pope's personal infallibility are good logicians. If the Catholic faithful regard the voice of the Council as the voice of God, they must hold the Pope and the Bishop, and, therefore, the priests, out of whom Popes and Bishops are made, as above criticism. The tendency of Catholic teaching and discipline is well understood. There is a "divinity that doth hedge" a priest; and this to such a degree that it seems to be morally impossible for a good Catholic to tell the whole truth,

provided his Church is to be compromised thereby. If the time ever comes when the Catholic laity look upon a priest as they look upon another man, then the abandonment of the dogma of Church infallibility will not be very remote.

The cases of Servetus and Kepler, of Bruno and Galileo, then, stand on very different footings. The crimes against the former were committed by weak and sinning men; those against the latter by the spiritually illuminated Pope and Cardinals of an infallible Church. In the one case the intelligent Protestant condemns; in the other the most liberal and intelligent Catholics excuse and defend.

Yet once more: *The Catholic World* says, granting the decree of the Inquisition to have been all that is claimed, it was, after all, nothing but a decree of the Inquisition. And again: "The Inquisition forms no permanent or essential part of the organization of the Catholic Church." The Inquisition has existed for six hundred and fifty years, and unless it is soon abolished, we fear it will become "permanent." The Pope, who seems to have regarded it "essential," called it the "sheet-anchor of the Church." But the Pope is both a "permanent" and "essential part of the Church." Now, Paul V dictated the decree of 1616, and Urban VIII approved, if he did not dictate, that of 1633—facts that should make the *World* ashamed of its wretched quibble.

To return to Galileo: He survived his condemnation nine years, retaining his vigor of mind to the last. When he became blind he said, "So it pleases God, and shall, therefore, please me also." The displeasure of the Church followed him to the end. He died in 1642, the prisoner of the Inquisition. He was forbidden to make a will. His body was denied Christian burial, and for a century it lay in a dishonored grave. His friends provided a monument to his memory, but the Pope forbade its erection. His fame was left to posterity, and well has it been vindicated. History has a brilliant page for his discoveries; and the man of large mind and heart has sympathy for him in his sorrows, and charity for him in his errors. Throughout the better ages that are to come, the story of

"The starry Galileo, with his woes,"

will still be told as one of high achievement and human frailty on the one hand, of dense ignorance and brutal intolerance on the other.

II.—PHASES OF RELIGION IN THE UNITED STATES.

THE American people are on the eve of the solution of a great problem. The problem is very complex. The greatest minds are working at it. The grand absorbing question is the *Identification of the Church of Christ*. The theological struggle of the age is opening between those who are simply working toward sectarian ascendancy, and those who are determined, at almost any sacrifice, save the sacrifice of principle, to restore the Ancient Order of things, as proclaimed by the inspired Apostles. Numerically, the pleaders for ecclesiasticism possess the vantage-ground; but in moral force they are losing ground every day. Evidently, the master minds of the age feel, and with quickened pulsation, that the solution of the vexed question of Church identification or sectarian consolidation will result, either in plunging the American people still deeper into the waves of sectarian confusion, or in planting them on a platform where honest men can see eye to eye, and love as brethren of one common Lord.

There are no less than four great leading parties engaged in this theological tournament: Rationalists, Roman Catholics, Protestant Sectarians, and Christians.

Rationalists are simply negative men—their philosophy (if they have one) is a negation. They affirm nothing, and deny all. They construct nothing, but pull down every thing. Their policy is that of disorganizing, and by that means producing confusion and doubts. It seems to be their business to classify contradictions; to laugh at the calamities of sectarian system builders; to mock at the poorly performed piety of blind zealots; to glut themselves on the moral putridity of shameless hypocrites. In a word, they see nothing spiritually beautiful, morally sublime, or intellectually transcendent in the religion of Christ. The god of this world is their god. Nothing would please them better than the dethronement of Christ. A dismembered Church would be the height of their delight. If the Church should go to ruin, they would be the first to pick up the spoils.

The boast of the Roman Catholic Church is her *Unity*. If this Church were founded on Christ, and not on Peter; if she were actuated by the love of principle, and not by priestly policy; if Christ stood first, and the Pope stood nowhere; if the Bible should be adopted, and tradition be rejected; if the Church of Rome would lay aside assumed infallibility, and submit to the simple teaching of the Holy Scriptures; if all these should transpire, then, among an enlightened people, and in this age of wonderful mental activity and religious agitation, she might overwhelm all parties by her resistless power. In the present distracted condition of the religious world, if wisely watching the tide of affairs, the Papal power might perform a *coup d'état* that would result in a complete discomfiture of Protestant sectarianism, and, to the astonishment of the world, produce the grand consummation of apostolic Christian unity. Paradoxical as such a proposition may seem, and impracticable as every one might conceive it to be, the full accomplishment of such a moral revolution, in our humble estimation, could be more hopefully anticipated than the consolidation of the antagonistic parties of the Protestant world. But whatever, in a general sense, the Pope's secret designs may be, of one thing we may be certain, so far as the United States are involved, that, with an eager and sleepless eye, he watches the perplexities and contortions of his Protestant antagonists. He evidently understands, what few Protestants apprehend, that Protestant divisions, and therefore Protestant failures, mean Papal unity and Papal prosperity. But with all the advantages of Protestant division on the side of the Papacy, the powers of Popery in the United States, as in Europe, are in perplexity. The apparent, if not real, instability of the Papal See in Rome, as well as the revolutions in Italy, have had much to do, no doubt, in guiding the policy of the Papal powers here, and in causing them to put their prudential measures in such a form as to meet the exigencies of the times and "the Church." The late positive and pointed refusals of the bishops of the Anglican Church, and of the patriarch of the Greek Church, to accept the glowing invitation of the Pope of Rome, to be present at the forthcoming Ecumenical Council, to be held next autumn on the classic banks of the Tiber, where it is proposed to determine the destinies of the Church, have now, and shall have, much to do in shaping the policy of the priests in America, and in molding the public mind

to endure or reject the impostures of the self-styled Sovereign Pontiff.

But the said old gentleman is full of intrigue, and his art of *finesse* is, apparently, inexhaustible. While in Europe public sentiment is rapidly turning in favor of the dissolution of Church and State, and in favor of Church independency, here, in America, as a *dernier ressort*, the Papal authorities are most persistently advocating the startling doctrine, that *the public school funds should be devoted to schools under the immediate supervision of the various religious sects*. And in order to consummate this end, they not only use their own journals in its advocacy, but they even subsidize whatever conscienceless literary magazines they can lay hold of, that, with more efficiency, they may be enabled to accomplish their foul purposes. But this bold attempt at making Churches dependent on State patronage will, no doubt, at once be met by a proud and defiant people—and by those who can not, when the test comes, permit the tread of such an innovation—many thousands of which people, now American citizens, were only too glad to have once escaped the very despotism with which they are now threatened. The humiliation of Pius IX in the Old World is deeply felt in the New World. It is manifest that Pius understands the signs of the times. He does not now thunder his anathemas from the porch of the Vatican, nor offer insults and indignities to people and governments, as did his illustrious predecessors, Gregory VII and Innocent III, several hundred years ago. Our present Pope is becoming very temperate in his zeal, very mild and suave in his spiritual manners, and extremely complaisant to all political governments. This same fawning, beseeching spirit is evidenced in the low tricks and cunning diplomacy of his servile subjects in America. To show that the Romanists are greatly alarmed, and to give the reader an idea of the *status* of the Catholic Church in America, we quote from the *Universe*, one of their own popular journals, published in Philadelphia :

“It is, *perhaps*, quite legitimate to boast with snug self-satisfaction of the growth of the Church in America. But, for our part, we doubt it. They would doubt it in Rome if they knew the real figures. The Church in America is, in truth, a sad Church. It is all as a priest said in our last number, a section from the bleeding side of Ireland, and it is not able to retain what it gets. Look! In one city alone it loses, at a single stroke, twenty thousand souls! Who, in presence of such a dreadful truth, can say that the Church here gains more than it

loses—that it even preserves its natural integrity? For the twenty thousand in one city alone, does it gain twenty thousand throughout the whole remainder of the country? Ah, no! no! no! Had the poor parents of these twenty thousand children remained at home in Ireland, there had been no loss to the faith, because, though they had died early, leaving nothing to their children, vagrancy in Ireland does not entail the loss of faith. Such is the holy character of that country, that the fire of faith is always aglow in it. And New York is not the only *via crucis* the Church has in America. Philadelphia is not much less populous than New York. How many children are lost to the faith in this honest Quaker city every year? Count up our great cities. They are New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Baltimore, New Orleans, Cincinnati, Chicago, Pittsburg, Charleston, Washington, etc., and to these may be added an immense number of very populous minor places. Taking the figures for New York to be correct, and the authority that gives them is reliable, it is a certain fact that not less than two hundred thousand baptized Irish Catholic children are lost every year to the faith in America. How true the great Archbishop Kendrick was, as a clergyman wrote in these columns last week, when he maintained that the Church here is constantly losing more than it gains! What does it gain? Emigrants—nothing but emigrants. What does it lose? The one case in issue shows that it loses every year two hundred thousand of the children of these same poor emigrants. What can be more unfortunate or degenerate than that? Two hundred thousand Irish children—the best Catholic stock in the world—lost every year!”

The *Tablet*, another Catholic organ, tries to whistle up its courage in the following *dead-march* style:

“But the actual number of conversions which annually take place, when we include the whole of our vast country, is very large, and must amount to many thousands, mostly from the more educated and enlightened class of non-Catholics. When we add to this the strong Catholic tendencies manifested in several Protestant sects, by a large and growing minority composed of the most intelligent and earnest portion of those sects, not only may Catholics hope and labor for the conversion of the country, but Protestants may well fear such conversion, and strive to avert it, though at present the majority of non-Catholics are drifting toward Rationalism and Naturalism; yet considering that there is nothing in either to satisfy the wants of the soul, we think Protestants are not alarmed wholly without reason, and that nothing is more natural than their recent combination to write our religion down. The Church has attractions which no form of Protestantism or Infidelity offers, or can offer; and if suffered to operate freely according to her own Divine laws, can not fail in the end to draw the whole population within her fold. Can effete Protestantism any longer prevent it?”

From these spicy extracts it will be seen that Rome is terribly perplexed, and that the most sagacious of her powerful pleaders are at their wits' end.*

*The *New York Advocate* concludes an article on the subject—“Romanism in the United States”—with these words:

“Three facts defeat Popery in this country. 1. It can not raise here a *native ministry*.

We take the following statistics from the *Almanac* of the Episcopal Church, for 1869:

Dioceses,	39	Baptisms—Infants,	26,835
Bishops,	47	“ Adults,	7,067
Bishops elect,	2	“ Not stated,	1,800
Priests and Deacons,	2,687	Confirmations,	21,958
Whole number of Clergy,	2,736	Communicants,	194,692
Parishes,	2,402	Marriages,	9,945
Ordinations—Deacons,	108	Burials,	15,346
“ Priests,	98	Sunday-school Teachers,	21,711
Candidates for Orders,	331	“ Scholars,	194,046
Churches Consecrated,	38	Contributions,	\$4,457,888.28

This Church has been greatly agitated, during the last year, on the question whether ministers, not ordained according to Episcopal orders, have the right to officiate in the sacred office of a minister of the Gospel. The contention has raged furiously, one class denying the validity of the orders of the non-Episcopal ministers, and refusing to admit that they are, in any legitimate sense, ministers of the Gospel at all; another class acknowledging the validity of such orders, but not approving of any practical recogni-

Its young men of talent will not become priests. They are swayed too much by American ideas to do so. They do n't like celibacy; and other than ecclesiastical forms of public life, as well as the open doors for commercial or financial success, are too inviting. Here and there you can find a native priest, but they are anomalies. What now would become of the Methodist, the Baptist, Presbyterian, or even the Episcopal denomination, if they had to import continually an outlandish priesthood—men marked by their very ‘brogue’ as foreigners? They would, sooner or later, be enervated through all their ranks by the fact. Only while most of their people came from abroad like the priesthood, could they hold their own. Such a dependence is too anti-American to succeed in this New World. With the diminution of Irish immigration (and that has already commenced) Popery will have a rapid decadence. 2. Popery is universally felt to be abnormal in America. We all tolerate it, for toleration is a fundamental necessity of our political system; but no thoughtful citizen, not a Papist, can avoid the conviction, we might say the intuition, that not merely its hierarchical organization, but its whole genius, is incompatible with the spirit of the country. And we have only to open our eyes to see practical proof of the fact all around us. This is the great obstacle to its success here. Hence its comparatively few conversions from Protestantism; for whatever occasional ado is made over examples of proselytism, they are numerically insignificant, and incomparably fewer than the losses of the Church to other denominations. 3. But, again, Popery is smitten with general decay in Europe, and this fact affects it profoundly in America. Men do not care to sail on a sinking ship. The state of Romanism in Austria, Spain, Italy itself, shows that whatever may be its spasmodic efforts abroad, the foundations are sliding from beneath it in its oldest fortifications. Americans see this fact, and the public consciousness of the country tacitly recognizes Popery as an effete thing of the past.

“The easiest way to convert Papists is to let them come as fast as they please to America. We must suffer by their coming, but we are doing an incalculable good for Christendom by that suffering. Their children in the second, at farthest in the third, generation, are ours. The spirit of our free country dissolves and dispels the mediæval substance of Popery.”

tion of it; while still a third party believe non-Episcopal ministers to be true ministers, and, accordingly, treat them as such. The *Protestant Churchman* belongs to the last class mentioned, and thus the editor expresses his convictions:

"Our ministerial brethren are just as dear to us as ever, and we hold their title to minister in holy things as valid and of Divine origin, and we do not propose to vary from our uniform policy of complete recognition and fraternal intercourse. . . . The General Convention, in enacting such a law, has transcended its rightful power, and no right-minded man will long hesitate in coming to a decision as to whether he is to obey fallible men, or Christ, to whom he owes paramount allegiance."

Here is an evidence of the fact, again, that the enlightened masses will not tamely submit to the mere assumptions of bishops and clergy, who give the inquiring people no other reasons for the doctrines imposed upon them than the mere *dogmata* of a carnalized Church. Manifestly, the people have lived on theological husks long enough. The people, like pale, sickly tubers, in a dark cellar, are reaching out after light. Here is a specimen of silly twaddle from the *Christian Witness and Church Advocate*, presenting more the appearance of a mountebank performance, or the freaks and fancies of monomaniacs, than the cool and deliberate actions of wise and conscientious men of God:

"The issue was not whether it is a breach of the rubric to direct a person not in the Episcopal orders to read the Declaration of Absolution. Nor was it decided whether 'exchanging' with non-Episcopal ministers is 'disorder,' or a breach of the ordination vow; nor whether it is illegal for an Episcopal clergyman to avail himself, in his public services, of the aid of a non-Episcopal minister. The single issue before the court was, whether it is a breach of our canon law for a clergyman of our Church to avail himself, in Divine worship, of the services of persons not ordained clergymen of our own particular Church. If the court had decided that it is a criminal offense for a clergyman to employ a person in the services, unless he has orders from our own Episcopate, it would have placed the stamp of illegality on lay reading; the chanting by choristers of those parts of the services assigned to the minister; addresses by Sunday-school Superintendents, and other lay 'preachings' which our bishops have encouraged, and which, in some relations, our canons have expressly sanctioned, applying to them the very term 'officiate.'"

The *Church Journal* goes straight against the word "Protestant," and perpetrates some sad anachronisms by trying to explain how, through some "inadvertence," that name, now, of a sudden so heartily despised, was introduced into the Prayer Book.

The golden-haired and highly-perfumed daughter of the "Mother Church" seems to be as deep down in the ditch of doubt and perplexity as her own *Alma Mater*, who burned Cranmer, and Latimer, and Ridley at the stake. Hear the protest of the *Journal*:

"In short, there are now two kinds of Protestantism—the Catholic and the anti-Catholic. The first is that of the Anglican Church; resisting, with a power that is felt and appreciated in the right quarter, the un-Catholic developments of the Church of Rome. The second is that of the non-Episcopal sects, resisting, not only the errors of Rome, but also the very Constitution, the Order, and much of the most sacred Faith of the Holy Catholic Church. If, by some confusion of thought in other times, or by some unexplained inadvertence, the name of 'Protestant' gained place on the title of the Prayer Book, let it not be thought by any Churchman that license is thereby given to blot out the very truths which God's saints have revered, and to join arms with others, lest, in assailing Rome with one hand they recklessly stab with the other their own Church—the mother who nourished them."

From the tables of the General Minutes of the Methodist Episcopal General Convention, the *Methodist* produces the following facts:

"The total number of members reported is 1,259,115—an increase over last year of 109,634. The number of infant baptisms is 46,207; of adults baptized, 67,065—giving a ratio of infant to adult baptisms of about two to three, and showing that but one infant has been baptized to about twenty-seven Church members, while more than one-half of those received into the Church have not been baptized in their infancy. These ratios vary in the different parts of the country. In six New England Conferences, the adults are about seven times as many as the infant baptisms, and one infant is baptized to about one hundred and forty-three members. In the Baltimore Conference we find the opposite extreme, there being six times as many children as adults baptized, and one infant baptism to about nine members. The other Conferences lie between these two extremes. The Methodist Church South is reported to aggregate a membership of 535,040 members and probationers, and 2,581 traveling and 3,952 local preachers. This membership, added to that of the Northern Church, makes a total of over one million and three quarters."*

Judging from these ratios of decrease on the practice of infant baptism compared with former years, we conclude that the practice is rapidly coming into disrepute, occasioned, we doubt not, by Bible investigation, and by the exposure of that Papal assumption through

*There are among us ten Methodist denominations: 1. The Methodist Episcopal Church, with nine Bishops, 8,481 traveling and 9,899 local preachers, and 1,225,115 members; 2. The Methodist Episcopal Church South, with — Bishops, 2,581 traveling and 3,952 local preachers, and 535,040 members; 3. The Methodist Protestant Church, with 72,000 members; 4. The Methodist (Protestant) Church, with 640 traveling and 444 local preachers, and 50,000 members; 5. The Wesleyan Connection, with 15,000 members; 6. The Evangelical Association, with 500 preachers, and 64,814 members; 7. The African

constant debate. With the exception of Catholics and Episcopalians, this same proportionate decrease may be observed in every other Protestant Church. And we venture to assert that, from the same cause of close investigation on the part of the enlightened masses, there have been *more persons immersed* in the various Protestant denominations, according to the proportion of increase in adult membership, than ever before, since the organization of those various religious bodies. This phase of Church reformation is truly encouraging. By instituting a comparison of facts and figures, it can be observed that the increase and decrease of infant baptisms vary according to the religious enlightenment of any particular community. If the facts were produced, we feel assured that every body would be astonished to know how many immersed persons there are in the pedo-baptist Churches of the present day.

In respect to "Lay Representation" and the control of the funds of the Methodist Church, the *Methodist*, the most independent Protestant journal in America, says:

"We hold: 1. That the laity should participate in the control of the funds they contribute to the work of the Church. 2. That, in the absence of Lay Representation, the General Conference has very wisely committed the control of the funds and property of its great charities to joint Boards. 3. That before the assumption of the possessory rights of the connexional societies by the General Conference, it is most expedient that the laity should therein be represented. As the General Conference is receding from its old-time policy of non-interference in the management of the property interests of the Church, it is of the utmost importance that the way for such a great change in our government should be prepared by Lay Representation. Laymen once admitted to the General Conference, the whole economy of Methodism is simplified. The Church then, fully represented, controls all its own interests, spiritual and temporal."

Here is an acknowledgment of the fact that the people must be heard. The enlightened masses will not, in a free government, endure either religious or political centralization. There can be no monarchy where the Bible becomes the text-book of the nation. Even General Conferences must recede from their "old-time policy"

Methodist Episcopal Church, with 600 traveling preachers, and 200,000 members; 8. The African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, with 694 preachers, and 164,000 members; 9. The Free Methodists, with 94 preachers, and 6,000 members; 10. The Primitive Methodists, with 20 traveling preachers, and 2,000 members. These figures aggregate 27,889 traveling and local ministers, with 2,359,966 members. Two of the denominations do not give their traveling and several do not give their local ministers.—*Compiled from the "Ecclesiastical Almanac" for 1869.*

of lording it over God's heritage. This demand for lay representation is the entering wedge that shall eventually lead to Church independency—even in the Methodist Episcopal Church.

The Methodist Church of the United States has appropriated, for the year 1869, *eight hundred and fifty thousand dollars* for home and foreign missions. This stands without a parallel in the history of the Protestant Church. Such missionary zeal and activity characterize no other Church of this age—not even the Roman Catholic. From the beginning they have been an extraordinary missionary people. Untiring zeal and devotion, united to unity of faith and unity of action, have produced these wonderful results. Let those who professedly stand on the apostolic platform note these facts, and realize, that if a Church, not by any means apostolic, can, by unity of faith and concentrated activity, extend the Methodist Church to such great proportions, certainly those who claim to occupy the vantage-ground should, in proportion to their means and opportunities, accomplish equally as much, if not much more.

The aggregate number of Presbyterians in the United States (embracing all branches of that body) stands at between four and five hundred thousand.* From what statistics we have read during the past year, we can not see that the Presbyterian Church has kept pace with other Churches. We think that, so far as her membership is concerned, if not actually on the decrease, the Church is standing still. It is a notable fact, that, in many portions of the country, *Calvinistic* Presbyterianism is dying out, or is being largely absorbed by the Congregational Church, and by other Churches. We are of the opinion that her moral forces are weakening every day. So many other Churches, of more extended views, and of a greater knowledge of the Bible, have so far outstripped her in all that pertains to mental activity and spiritual development, that by comparison she grows smaller every day; although it must be confessed, that so far as wealth and prestige, and learned and distinguished men are concerned, she has nothing to be ashamed of.

* 1. Old School Presbyterians, with 2,330 preachers, and 252,555 members; 2. New School Presbyterians, with 168 preachers, and 168,932 members; 3. United Presbyterians, with 401 preachers, and 65,612 members; 4. Cumberland Presbyterians, with 1,500 preachers, and 130,000 members; 5. Reformed Presbyterians, with 77 preachers, and 8,487 members; 6. Four Associate and Associate Reformed bodies, with 159 preachers, and 8,543 members; 7. Southern Presbyterians, with 786 preachers, and 76,949 members.—*Compiled from the "Ecclesiastical Almanac" for 1869.*

The following statistics, from the January number of the *Congregational Quarterly*, show conclusively that, at the present rate of increase, the day is not very far distant, when the Congregational Church will be far in advance of what the Presbyterian Church now is :

"It appears that the total number of churches in the United States is 2,951, a gain of 132. The number of ministers is 3,070, a gain therein of 99 since last year. The number of churches unsupplied with ministers is 5 less than last year ; the number supplied, 149 greater. The number of Church members is 291,042, a net gain of 12,334. The additions by profession have been 16,432, a number exceeded in only two of the previous eleven years. Infant baptisms number 5,291, much above the average of the last eleven years. Sunday-schools report a membership of 339,205 in the United States, an increase in the United States of 25,334."

As a Protestant denomination, we regard it as approximating nearer the standard of the primitive Church, and as being less inclined to adhere to the dogmas of a creed than any other body of people in the United States, save the Church of Christ, as represented by the Disciples of Christ. In respect to Church government, in respect to their want of faith in special revelations beyond and above the Word of God, and in respect to the action of baptism and their repudiation of infant baptism, the people who compose that Church are positively and decidedly in advance of all Protestant competitors. The present form of Congregationalism varies in many respects from what it was one hundred years ago. They are anti-bishop, anti-ritualistic, decidedly anti-Pope, and plead common justice and equality for all men. We believe them to be less sectarian than any other Protestant Church, though there is room for much Scriptural improvement among that people. Though in many respects similar to the Presbyterian Church in polity, yet so far as the leaders of both organizations are concerned, we notice the fact that Presbyterian doctors of divinity are somewhat jealous of Congregational doctors of divinity.

The Baptist Church, in many portions of the country, is largely on the increase. Baptists of all sorts, in the United States, approximate probably one million of communicants.* Professedly a free

* They are separated into ten denominations : 1. Regular Baptists, with 8,346 preachers, and 1,094,806 members ; 2. Southern Baptists, with its preachers and members not given ; 3. Free-Will Baptists, with 1,161 preachers, and 61,244 members ; 4. General Baptists, with 4,743 members ; 5. Anti-Mission Baptists, with 105,000 members ; 6. Six-Principle Baptists, with 3,000 members ; 7. Winebrenarians (Church of God), with 32,000 members ; 8. Seventh-Day Baptists, with 7,033 members ; 9. Tunkers, with 20,000 members ; 10. Mennonites, with 36,280 members.—Compiled from the "*Ecclesiastical Almanac*" for 1869.

religious people, and boasting of large liberty and freedom of conscience, we know of no people more religiously selfish and contracted, and of none less inclined to favor Christian Union than they. For several years they have been sweating and fretting over the question *whether baptism is to be regarded as an invariable prerequisite to communion*, for which there is express Scriptural command. Surely, if *immersion* was the only apostolic mode of baptism, this communion question is a singular one about which to raise a controversy. But in the Baptist Church we have two parties pulling two ways. The majority of them do not seem to comprehend the real question. They might as well be pedobaptists as what they are. According to apostolic teaching, in the primitive Church none were received as communicants except the baptized, and if immersion was the *only* recognized mode, then it follows, as a matter of course, that pedobaptists are not Scriptural communicants. The Baptists seem to be in a perfect muddle on this question. Baptists, to be consistent, must hold that immersion is prerequisite to communion with Christ. When they abandon that ground, they cease to be Baptists, and they are at once reduced to the rank of pedobaptists, and, therefore, they might as well cease from performing even sprinkling, and have no kind of baptism. A late writer in the *Spare Hour* declares :

"That it was not till 1833 that Dr. J. Newton Brown prepared what is known as 'The New Hampshire Confession of Faith,' (Baptist,) where, for the first time in the whole history of evangelical denominations, we find baptism declared to be a prerequisite to the Lord's Supper. The XIVth Article reads : 'We believe that Christian baptism is the immersion in water of a believer, into the name of the Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost ; to show forth in a solemn and beautiful emblem our faith in the crucified, buried, and risen Savior, with its effect in our death to sin, and resurrection to a new life ; that *it is a prerequisite to the privileges of a Church relation, and to the Lord's Supper.*' Since 1833 many Churches have adopted this confession, but unquestionably the great majority of Baptist Churches throughout this country own the Confession of 1689, better known as the Philadelphia Confession, which has no such exclusive clause."

Francis Wayland, on the score of general intelligence and *religious* honesty, was far in advance of the mass of his Baptist brethren. In his work entitled "*Principles and Practices of Baptists*," he says : "We baptize those who have been sprinkled in infancy, because we do not consider them to have been baptized. We consider ourselves not to *baptize again*, but to baptize those who never yet have submitted themselves to this ordinance. So with respect to restricted

communion, the doctrine held by most Baptists in this country. We, with most other denominations, believe that a person must be baptized before he is admitted to the ordinance of the Supper. If, then, we do not admit to the table of the Lord those whom we do not believe to be baptized, we do precisely the same as our brethren who differ from us." (Page 98.) But judging by the manner in which the Baptists of the present day are wrangling over this plain Scriptural matter, we must decide, much as we regret to do so, that Baptists are retrograding instead of advancing toward the apostolic standard.

The Lutheran Church does not by any means keep pace with other Protestant Churches, but is rather falling into the background, not only in respect to numbers, but in intellectual and moral force.* A large proportion of her membership is being absorbed by other Churches, such as evince more of the spirit of American enterprise and activity than the old stereotyped Lutheran Church. The following statistics from the *Lutheran* (one of their leading journals) show how that Church retains its identity:

"The vast immigration from Germany is doing for Lutheranism in this country what the Irish immigration has done for Romanism. While the united strength of the two schools of Presbyterianism will be a membership of 407,889, the Lutherans have a membership numbering but 56,029 less than that aggregate. The immigration from Germany is mainly composed of Prussian Protestants, and is rapidly increasing; and, ere long, the denomination will be inferior in numerical strength only to the Roman Catholics, Methodists, and Baptists. They greatly need a more numerous body of clergy—having but 1,748 ministers, while Presbyterians have 4,172. The Philadelphia Lutheran Seminary, last year, graduated eleven theological students, and eight the previous year. Last year, the emigration from Germany to this country amounted to 124,803, being more than from Ireland."

The strength of the *German Reformed Church* is, possibly, one hundred and fifty thousand.† They increase with considerable rapidity in certain localities. Some eminent theologians stand connected with that body of people, among whom may be mentioned Drs. Nevin and Schaff. In some respects, they are in advance of their Protestant contemporaries. Their views on baptism and regeneration are much like those of Methodists. They have an "Order of Worship" prescribed in some of their Churches, and not a few of their pastors boldly advocate a "liturgical service."

* 1,792 ministers; 350,000 members.

† Reported: 505 ministers; 115,483 confirmed and 68,186 unconfirmed members.

The *Unitarians* are at sea without a compass. Below we present some figures and facts :

"The *Year Book*, published by the Unitarian Association, states that, within two years, fifty-one Unitarian churches have been built, enlarged, or otherwise improved, and that several are in process of erection which are not included in this number. It gives a list of 300 societies (65 of which have no settled minister) and 370 ministers. Many of the latter are retired, or, at least, without charge, and unwilling to settle. Besides the National Conference, and in connection with it, there are fourteen local Conferences in different parts of the country. There are thirteen ministerial associations, three theological schools, with sixty-seven students, and six publications. Three Conferences are organized under the name of Liberal Christians—one in Central New York, one in Maine, and there are five Christian Unions, one in each of the cities of Boston, New York, Brooklyn, Washington, and Chicago."

They seem not to be in agreement among themselves. They lack unity, have no fixed basis of principles, and oscillate from point to point, according to the caprices of the leaders. Dr. Bellows, writing to the *Examiner*, and commenting on the action of unbelievers, in one of their late Conferences, says :

"It is our sad conviction that rationalistic and semi-Christian, or anti-Christian, proclivities and opinions prevail in our body much more extensively than is confessed, or even known ; and that they require kind, tender, serious, but also frank, and positive, vigorous opposition. If they can not be checked by this process, the body can not long hold together. We fully believe that, if well understood, clearly faced, and thoughtfully considered, these semi-Christian, or unchristian, ideas would not be welcomed, approved, or accepted. To make them better understood ought to be the painstaking effort of all believers in the Gospel and Church of Jesus Christ."

Where a people have no central idea of cohesion, what else can we expect more than the foregoing statements ? The same may, with equal propriety, be said of the Universalists, who have no other bond of union beyond that of common fraternity. We can not see that either of these parties advance, in the least, the common cause of Christianity. A committee, at the same convention, reporting on the destitution of Unitarian literature, reported as follows :

"We have no edition of the Bible which can be read in our families with full confidence in its representation of the original text, or in the notes by which it is accompanied. We have no introduction to the Bible for general use ; no popular commentary on the Old Testament ; no complete commentary on the New. We have no Unitarian ecclesiastical history. The want is deeply felt of more books of a devotional and meditative character."

Where there is no Christ—the Son of God—why deplore the want of a Christian literature? Literature on Freemasonry or Odd-Fellowism would answer the same purpose. A New York correspondent of the *Watchman and Reflector*, some time since, wrote as follows:

“There was a prospect, some time since, that both of the Universalist societies in Brooklyn would be abandoned. The handsome stone edifice on the heights has been sold to the Swedenborgians. The pastor of the other society has left for want of a support, and that house is advertised for sale. An attempt has now been made to unite the two, so that the cause may be saved. Fifty years ago, Mr. Mitchell alone represented the sect in New York. He was of the Murray school, and preached decidedly and vigorously the doctrines that cluster around the Trinity. He thought punishment would eventually come to an end. When the new order of Universalism arose, that preached death and glory, and taught that death put a full and final period to all punishment, and denied the divinity of the Savior, Mr. Mitchell refused to recognize their ministers as Christians. He stood alone to the day of his death, and his church is now occupied by the Romanists. The Universalists have formed many societies in this city, the greater number of which have been short-lived. Dr. Chapin’s Church, and that on Bleecker-street, are all that amount to any thing in this city. Chapin’s congregation is held together by the magnetism of his own eloquence. Besides the two congregations in Brooklyn, which are near their end, it is not known that there is a single society on Long Island.”

What is denominated Christian Union was the theme of much agitation during the year 1868. From present appearances the agitation will increase. Whether the discussion of this subject shall result in true *Christian* unity, or simply in sectarian consolidation, is yet to be seen. The result, so far, is thus summed up by the *Methodist*:

“Among the denominations generally comprised under the name Evangelical, the desire of a closer union is still gaining strength. No corporate union of entire Churches has taken place during the past year, except that the Free-will Baptists, at their Triennial Convention, were joined by several associations of ‘General Baptists.’ But the union movements among the Methodist and Presbyterian denominations still successfully advance toward a consummation, which, in several cases, may be reached in the present year. But, though most of the Protestant denominations do not yet see their way clear toward the establishment of one organic body, which would do away with the distinctive marks of denominationalism, there is a general desire to recognize the substantial unity of spirit which already exists between them, and to give it expression. State and National Christian Conventions and Societies largely increase in number, and the idea of the great mission of the Evangelical Alliance, as the bond of Protestant Churches, is striking deep root. A new General Assembly of delegates from all the Protestant Churches of the world has been called, to meet in the city of New York, in

October, 1869. This Assembly will meet only a few weeks before the Ecumenical Council which the Pope has called for December, 1869, and will be the best reply the Protestant world can give to the Pope's letter to Protestants, inviting them to unite with the Church of Rome."

There was *talk* of union between the Episcopalians and Methodists, but neither organization seemed very much disposed to enter into a copartnership. The elements were antagonistic. There was considerable talk between Baptists and the Disciples of Christ on the subject of Church Union. The bitter Baptists, who are thoroughly saturated with the spirit of sectarianism, heartily opposed this move. But, nevertheless, by the process of disintegration, many Baptists are uniting with the people styled the *Disciples of Christ**—a people who reject all creeds and confessions of faith, except the Bible, and who propose Christian Union alone on "*the one foundation*," as declared by the inspired Apostles.

*This denomination is a branch of the Baptist denominations. It holds to no rule of faith but the Word of God, and rejects all doctrines or terms as binding which are founded on speculations of theology. It grew into a separate denomination under the influence of the example and teachings of Thomas Campbell, who settled in Pennsylvania in 1808, as a minister of the "Seceders," and of his son Alexander. The father was a conscientious advocate of religious reform, and contended for a restoration of the Christian Church to apostolic practice and precept. His son Alexander joined him, and they formed a small association of disciples for the special study of the Scriptures, who were to reject all creeds. This grew into a congregation, of which the Campbells became elders. An investigation of the subject of baptism led them to the belief that immersion was the only Scriptural method. For some years the Churches which were formed were attached to associations of Baptists. The history of their separation from the Baptists is thus given in *McClellan & Strong's Cyclopædia*:

"In 1823 Alexander Campbell established the *Christian Baptist*. Through this monthly, and several public oral debates on baptism, and extensive tours of preaching, his views spread rapidly and widely among the Baptists. But personal opposition at last took the form of ecclesiastical action, and, in 1827, the Dover Association of Virginia decreed the excommunication from Baptist fellowship of all who held and advocated the views of Alexander Campbell. This was the beginning of a general action among the Baptists, and the Reformers, as they were called, were compelled to associate in a separate organization, which rapidly increased, especially in Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, and Virginia. Churches were also formed in the British Provinces of North America, in England, Wales, Ireland, and Australia. They are increasing in all these countries, and in England are rapidly becoming numerous."

The Disciples are Congregational in their organization; regard very highly the obligation to provide for the preaching of the Gospel; are active and energetic, and accord, in essential doctrines, with "Evangelical" Christians. Their colleges are: Bethany College, Kentucky University, the North-Western Christian University, at Indianapolis, Indiana; Eureka College, Illinois, and Hiram College, Ohio. They have twenty-five periodicals, namely, nine weeklies, fifteen monthlies, and one quarterly. Of these, *two* (monthlies) are published, one in Great Britain and one in Canada; all the rest in the United States. They have 5,000 churches and 500,000 members.—*Ecclesiastical Almanac*, 1869.

The question of Christian Union seems to be forcing itself upon the attention of the popular religious leaders of the present day. There is no escape—the question is upon us, and discussion must go on, until either a positive or a negative result is gained. The *Methodist*, commenting at length on this vital and all-absorbing question, thus dilates :

“We know of nothing that appeals more strongly to evangelical Protestants of all Churches in behalf of the union movements which are now auspiciously progressing in our own and other countries. How would it strengthen the hands of Methodist missionaries in China if, instead of Methodist Episcopal, Southern Methodist, English Wesleyan, English New Connection, English United Methodist missionaries being sent out, the efforts of all American and English Methodists could be united for the planting of Methodist missions ! How much confusion it would save the pagans, who are favorably inclined toward Christianity, if no Protestant Churches had ever been divided by such distractions as now separate the Old, New School, Reformed, Cumberland, Church of Scotland, Free Church of Scotland Presbyterians, and the several branches of the Reformed Churches ! Viewed in this light, the many union movements now going on in the Christian Church, the progress of which we have regularly chronicled in our columns, can not but be a cause of great joy to every Protestant.”

“Irenæus,” of the *New York Observer*, writes on Christian Union frequently ; and lately, while commenting on the prayer of Christ for the unity of His people, expressed himself thus :

“Christians ought to be getting more and more closely to each other. They are strong in Christ ; strong when united ; they are like the Son only when united ; they are his witnesses that He came from God when they are one in Him.”

That is, indeed, a strong proposition. Why not work up to it by abandoning all sorts of sectarian shibboleths ? As another evidence of the growing sentiment of Christian union we mention, with peculiar pleasure, the fact that, but a few months since, at the “Clinton Avenue Congregational Church,” Brooklyn, “Christians of all evangelical denominations” “sat down together in brotherly concord at the communion table of their common Lord and Savior.”

We are of the opinion that sectarianism has reached its culmination. From this time forward it must recede from its present high point of oscillation. Dr. Ewer, of the Episcopal Church, who recently published “*Sermons on the Failure of Protestantism*,” unfolded more facts, and revealed more truths, than were pleasant or profitable to Protestant tastes. Protestantism, as at present represented by antagonistic sectarian parties, *is a failure*, so far as the conversion of

the world is concerned, and, unless there is a speedy return to the Bible and to apostolic teaching, as well as an utter repudiation of all things spiritual not sanctioned by the Word of God, the statement of this distinguished divine must stand unchallenged, unsavory as the *melange* may seem.

This dear doctor discovers the disease of Protestantism; but the remedy he proposes is not the "balm of Gilead." As the Pope of Rome has graciously invited all Protestants and infidels to flee to his bosom for refuge from the stormy blasts, so has the benevolent Dr. Ewer sent out glazed cards of invitation to all disaffected Protestant parties, stipulating, in cosmetic phrase, that the Episcopal Church is the city of refuge on the other side of Jordan.

None of these doctors of divinity reach the seat of the disease. We believe the Disciples of Christ (as they prefer to be called) are the only people who can read the diagnosis, and apply the remedy. They stop within the pale of no Protestant party to find the basis of Christian Union. They go beyond Protestantism, and beyond the Catholic and Greek Churches. They have no sympathy in a plea for Protestant union. Such a union would be one of policy and not of principle. The Disciples of Christ propose a radical change—not simply one of expedients. In order to consummate the lasting union of the Lord's people, the Disciples, who, without boasting, stand in advance of all parties on the method of such a union, propose:

1. The suppression of all unscriptural terms, and the introduction of a "pure speech."
2. The destruction of theological terminologies, of all mystical verbiage, and of all untaught philosophical, or rather sophistical, questions.
3. The elimination of all such unscriptural, and therefore sinful, designations as *Episcopal Church*, *Presbyterian Church*, *Methodist Church*, *Baptist Church*, and so on.
4. The destruction of sporadic sects by the Scriptural identification of Christ's Church.
5. The abolishment of creedism, and the proclamation of the "*one* body, the *one* Spirit, the *one* Lord, the *one* faith, the *one* baptism, the *one* foundation."
6. The dissolution of all centralized ecclesiastical governments, and the establishment of congregational independency.

III.—THE GLORIES OF MARY.

The Glories of Mary. Translated from the Italian of ST. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI, founder of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer. First American edition. New York: James B. Kirker.

BUT few Protestants are apprised of the existence of the book whose title we have placed at the head of this paper. Fewer still are aware of its surprising contents. *It is not intended for Protestant eyes.* And, when our readers shall have perused the extracts which we shall publish from it, they will not doubt that "the faithful" will witness this advertisement of their carefully-guarded treasure with wailing and gnashing of teeth. It is *esoteric* Catholicism—revealing its inner spirit, its *genuine* doctrine, in contrast with the Jesuitical representations of that doctrine.

We are told by the artful missionaries, whose influence now directs and controls most, if not all, of the Romish operations in this country, that the Catholic Church trusts alone in the merits of the Lord Jesus for salvation; that he is the sole fountain of grace and life, and the one mediator between God and men. As for the Blessed Virgin, they assure us that no Catholic pays *divine* honors to her. They even hold up their hands in holy horror that the Church should be *so* slandered and injured! If pressed to say what is the real position assigned to Mary, they tell us that the Church regards her as a bright example of purity and virtue; that she is believed to feel a lively interest in the welfare of all good Catholics, and to pray for them in heaven the same as if she were still on earth; and that it is quite as proper to *ask* an interest in her prayers now as it would be were she still living among us. And this is all! The only *praying* that is done to *her* is to *ask* her to pray for *us*. And the idea that Catholics put their *trust* in her; expect to be *saved* by her; that they really *worship* her—why, it is too monstrous for belief!

This is *exoteric* Catholicism—that which is put forward to catch the simple and unwary. And, alas, how many have accepted some such statement as a correct representation of the true doctrine of the Church respecting Mary!

Now we are, fortunately, prepared to *demonstrate* the following propositions as the *genuine teaching* and *sincere faith* of the Catholic Church :

1. That Mary *coöperated* in the original work of human redemption.
2. That *she herself* conquered hell, and crushed the head of the serpent.
3. That she is *now* the *only Savior* of sinners.
4. That she is *Omnipotent*.
5. That she is *Queen of the Universe*.
6. That God himself is *under obligation*, and is *indebted* to her.
7. That, while she is represented as obtaining favors for mankind by prayer, her *petitions* are really *commands to God* !

We ask no man to believe that the Romish Church cherishes sentiments, and teaches doctrines, so antichristian and blasphemous, without *clear, explicit, abundant, and irrefragable proof*. If we do not demonstrate every one of the above propositions beyond all possible mistake or doubt, then let it be said that we have borne false witness. Our proofs shall be drawn from no Protestant source ; they shall not be the repudiated revelations of some Maria Monk ; nor the disturbed utterances of an obscure and infatuated devotee ; but the sober, deliberate, matured, and *approved* declarations of Abbots, Bishops, and Saints.

"The Glories of Mary," from which our testimonies shall be taken, is a *Catholic book*, published by a *Catholic house*, for the use of the *Catholic public of America*. Being a translation, it is introduced with the trust "that it will be found to retain the spirit of the learned and *saintly* author, and that it will be welcomed by *the faithful* in this country with the same *delight* which it has *universally called forth in Catholic Europe*." Lest some of the faithful should doubt the correctness of the *translation*, even *this* is guarded against, and the work, in its present form, is commended to the unhesitating acceptance of all by this *official* and *authoritative* indorsement :

"This new and improved translation of 'The Glories of Mary' having been *duly examined*, is hereby *approved* of.

"New York, Jan. 21, 1852.

† JOHN,

Archbishop of New York."

It will suffice to say of the author that he was himself a Bishop, appointed in 1762, by Pope Clement XIII. He was released from

this office, at his own request, by Pius VI, in 1775, being "old, sickly, and so exhausted by fasting and penance" that he was no longer able to perform its duties. In 1787 he died, at the advanced age of ninety years. But such was his reputation for piety and sanctity that, in the year 1816, his name was enrolled upon the calendar of Romish Saints, which is proof positive to all devout Catholics that "there must have been at least three *undeniable miracles* performed after his death through his invocation"—miracles that "were attested on oath by unimpeachable witnesses before a court of the most intelligent and upright men." (See Bull of Canonization.)

We mention all these circumstances to show that there is no possibility of evading the conclusion that *the doctrine* of this book is really and truly the doctrine of the Catholic Church. For certainly no Bishop of that Church, who lived and died in its communion, and who was afterward canonized or enrolled as a saint, and the very invocation of whose name served to work miracles, can be regarded as heretic, or as holding and teaching any thing but genuine and approved Catholic doctrine. Then he declares, on the fly-leaf of this work, that he is "an obedient son of the holy Roman Catholic Church and the holy Apostolic See," and, therefore, he adds, "to their judgment, I submit myself and *whatever I have written in this book.*"

Like all Catholic books, this one was carefully and duly examined by high Catholic officials before it was published, to see if it contained a *line*, or even a *word*, that was not perfectly in harmony with the faith and doctrines of the Church, and if so, to *strike it out*, or "expurgate" it. They *approved* it—authorized its publication, commended and indorsed it to "the faithful" as containing nothing but sound and wholesome Catholic doctrine; and, as such, they received it, and read it with universal delight. *It was after this that the author was enrolled as a Saint.* The translation from which we shall quote has passed the very same scrutiny, has been duly examined, and, as we have seen, is officially indorsed and *approved of*. There can be no sort of question, therefore, *that whatever this book teaches is to-day the deliberate, matured, carefully expressed, solemnly tested, and approved doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church.*

So much for the *authority* of the work. Now let us see if it teaches the propositions which we have submitted. The first is:

I. THAT MARY COÖPERATED IN THE ORIGINAL WORK OF HUMAN REDEMPTION.

Under this head we direct attention to the following extracts, noting in every place the page, that they may be verified :

"It is true, that in dying for the redemption of the world, Jesus wished to be alone. I have trodden the wine-press alone, 'Torcular calcavi solus.' But when God saw the great desire of Mary to devote herself to the salvation of men, he ordained that by the sacrifice and offering of the life of this same Jesus, *she might coöperate with him in the work of our salvation*, and thus become mother of our souls." (P. 43.)

"St. Bernard says, that as a man and a woman have coöperated for our ruin, so it was fit that another man and another woman should *coöperate for our restoration*; and these were Jesus and his mother Mary. Doubtless, says the Saint, Jesus Christ, alone, was all-sufficient for our redemption; yet it was more fitting that *each sex should take part in our redemption*, when both took part in our corruption. For this reason, blessed Albertus Magnus calls Mary the *coöperatrix with Christ in our redemption*—'Adjutrix Redemptionis.' And she, herself, revealed to St. Bridget, that as Adam and Eve sold the world for one apple, so her *Son and herself*, with one heart, *redeemed the world*. God could indeed, as St. Anselm asserts, create the world from nothing; but when it was lost by sin *he could not redeem it without the coöperation of Mary*." (P. 185.)

We had marked several other passages for quotation, but these are so direct and unambiguous that we must regard them as sufficient upon the first proposition. Let us proceed to establish, in like manner, the next—

2. THAT SHE CONQUERED HELL AND CRUSHED THE HEAD OF THE SERPENT.

The evidence on this point is equally clear and abundant :

"Not only most holy Mary is Queen of Heaven and of the Saints, but also of hell and the devils, for she has bravely *triumphed over them by her virtues*. From the beginning of the world God predicted to the infernal serpent *the victory* and the empire which *our Queen would obtain over him*, when he announced to him that *a woman would come into the world who should conquer him*. 'I will put enmities between thee and the woman; *she shall crush thy head*.'" (P. 155.)

"Mary, then, is this great and strong woman who *has conquered the devil and crushed his head* by subduing his pride; as the Lord added, 'She shall crush thy head.' Some of the commentators doubt whether these words refer to Mary or to Jesus Christ, because in the Septuagint version* we read: 'He shall crush thy head.' But in *our vulgate*, which is *the only version approved by the Council of Trent*, it is *she* and not he. . . . St. Bruno says, that Eve, by yielding to the serpent, brought into the world death and darkness, but that the Blessed Virgin, by

* And certainly also in the original Hebrew.

conquering the devil, brought us life and light. And she has bound him so that he can not move to do the least harm to her servants." (P. 156.)

"As men, says Thomas à Kempis, fall to the earth through fear, when a thunder-bolt strikes near them, so *fall prostrate the devils when but the name of Mary is heard.*" (P. 162.)

"Very glorious, O Mary, and wonderful, exclaims St. Bonaventure, is *thy great name.* Those who are mindful to utter it at the hour of death *have nothing to fear from hell,* for the devils at once abandon the soul *when they hear the name of Mary.*" (P. 163.)

This doctrine is sufficient, one would think, to blast forever the pretensions of the Church which teaches it. But worse, if possible, is yet to be exhibited. If we establish the next proposition by proofs equally explicit and conclusive, all that follows will serve but to show the depths to which it is possible for apostates to fall. We state it once more :

3. THAT MARY IS NOW THE ONLY SAVIOR OF SINNERS.

We freely admit that Jesus Christ is more than once *called*, in this book, *the only Savior*; but that this is simply an empty and unmeaning title, as applied to him, will become perfectly evident as we proceed; for it will be seen that in truth and fact *Mary* is regarded as *the one sole fountain* of grace, life, and salvation, and that Jesus Christ has nothing whatever to do with it. Owing to the peculiar construction of the book, we can not fully present this proof without the introduction of matter applicable to one or two of our remaining propositions. But our readers will be indulgent. We submit, first of all, the following :

"The kingdom of God consisting of justice and mercy, the Lord has *divided* it; he has reserved *the kingdom of justice for himself*, and he has granted *the kingdom of mercy to Mary*, ordaining that *all the mercies* which are dispensed to men should pass through the hands of Mary, and should be *bestowed according to her good pleasure.* St. Thomas confirms this in his preface to the Canonical Epistles, saying that the holy virgin, when she conceived the Divine Word in her womb, and brought him forth, obtained the half of the kingdom of God by becoming *Queen of Mercy*, Jesus Christ remaining King of Justice." (Pp. 27, 28.)

"Ernest, Archbishop of Prague, also says, that the eternal Father has given to the Son the *office of judging and punishing*, and to the mother, the *office of compassionating and relieving the wretched.*" (P. 29.)

"St. Bernard asks : 'Why does the Church name Mary *Queen of Mercy*?' And answers : 'Because we believe that *she* opens the depths of the mercy of God, to *whom she will, when she will, and as she will*; so that not even the vilest sinner is lost, if *Mary protects him.*'" (P. 31.)

As, then, it is only by mercy that we can be saved, and as Mary is the *sole* Queen and dispenser of mercy, it follows that she is the *only Savior*. Again, as *judging* and *punishing* can not save us, and as these are all that are left to Christ, it follows that he has now *nothing to do with saving us*. These, it is true, are but inferences. We believe them to follow necessarily from the premises, but we have *positive and direct proof*. As this pertains to a variety of subjects, we classify them for convenience of reference.

MARY THE ONLY HOPE AND REFUGE.

"St. Augustine rightly calls her the *only hope of us sinners*, since by *her* means *alone* we hope for the remission of all our sins. And St. John Chrysostom repeats the same thing, namely, that sinners receive pardon *only* through the intercession of Mary." (Pp. 83, 84.)

"Behold, O mother of my God, Mary, *my only hope*, behold at thy feet a miserable sinner, who implores *thy* mercy. Thou art proclaimed and called by the *whole Church*, and by *all* the faithful, *the refuge* of sinners; thou art my refuge; it is *thine* to save me." (P. 88.)

"Fly, O Adam, O Eve, and ye their children who have offended God; fly and take refuge in the bosom of this good mother. Do you not know that she is the *only city of refuge*, and the *only hope of sinners*?" (P. 129.)

"O Mary, we poor sinners know *no refuge but thee*. Thou art our *only hope*; to thee we *intrust* our salvation." (P. 130.)

"Hence Erasmus thus salutes the Virgin: 'Hail, terror of hell! hail, *hope of* Christians! *Confidence in thee* secures salvation.'" (P. 260.)

MARY IS THE SAVIOR IN FACT.

"Look upon me, and do not leave me until *thou* hast changed me *from a sinner into a saint*." (P. 38.)

"If he comes with a good intention, though he have committed all the sins in the world, she embraces him, and this loving *mother* condescends to *heal all the wounds of his soul*." (P. 71.)

"St. Ephraim thus salutes the *divine* mother: 'Hail, hope of the soul! hail, secure salvation of Christians! hail, helper of sinners! hail, defense of the faithful, and *salvation of the world*!'" (P. 117.)

"Richard of St. Laurence says: '*Our salvation is in the hands of Mary*.' . . . Cassian absolutely affirms that *the salvation of the whole world depends upon the favor and protection of Mary*.'" (P. 190.)

"I invoke, then, thy aid, O my great *advocate*, my refuge, my hope, and my mother Mary. To *thy hands* I commit the cause of my *eternal* salvation. To thee I consign my soul; it was lost, but *thou must save it*." (P. 239.)

"St. Bonaventure addresses her thus: 'Blessed are those who know thee, O mother of God! for to *know thee* is the path to *immortal life*, and to publish thy virtues is *the way to eternal salvation*.'" (P. 279.)

"St. Bernardine of Sienna says, that God did not destroy man after his fall, because of the peculiar love that he bore *his future child Mary*. And the saint adds,

that he doubts not all the mercy and pardon which sinners received under the Old Law, was granted them by God *solely for the sake of this blessed virgin.*" (P. 81.)

If any one, after reading these testimonies, can still doubt that Mary is looked upon as the only Savior of sinners, we ask him next to consider that

ALL GRACE IS IN MARY.

"Behold, O man! the design of God, a design arranged for our benefit, that he may be able to bestow upon us more abundantly his compassion; for wishing to redeem the human race, *he has placed the price of our redemption in the hands of Mary*, that she may dispense it at *her pleasure.*" (P. 118.)

"St. Irenæus says that the Divine Word, before incarnating himself in the womb of Mary, sent the archangel to obtain her consent, because *he would have the world indebted to Mary for the mystery of the incarnation.* Also the Idiot remarks, that every blessing, every help, *every grace* that men have received or will receive from God, to the end of the world, has come to them, and will come to them, through the intercession *and by means of Mary.*" (Pp. 118, 119.)

"St. Germanus, recognizing Mary to be *the source of every blessing* and the deliverance from every evil, thus invokes her: 'O my lady, thou alone art my help,' etc. (P. 119.)

The *holy Church*, in the office which she *requires* to be recited on the festivals of Mary, applying to her the words of Wisdom, gives us to understand that *in Mary* we shall find every hope: 'In me is all hope of life and virtue.' That *in Mary* we shall find *every grace*: 'In me is all grace of the way and of the truth.' In a word, that we shall find *in Mary life and eternal salvation.*" (Pp. 173, 174.)

"O, how many, exclaims the Abbot of Celles, who merit to be condemned by the Divine justice, *are saved by the mercy of Mary!* for she is the treasure of God and the *treasurer of all graces*; therefore it is that *our salvation is in her hands.* Let us always, then, have recourse to this mother of mercy, and confidently hope to be saved by means of her intercession; since *she*, as Bernardine de Bustis encourages us to believe, is *our salvation, our life*, our hope, our counsel, our refuge, our help. *Mary is that very throne of grace*, says St. Antoninus, to which the apostle exhorts us to have recourse with confidence, that we may obtain the Divine mercy, with all needed help for our salvation." (P. 300.)

MARY IS THE DOOR OF HEAVEN.

"For this reason, too, she is called *the gate of heaven* by the holy Church: 'Felix cœli porta;' because as every rescript of grace, sent by the King, comes through the palace gate, so it is given to Mary, that through her thou shouldst receive whatever thou hast. St. Bonaventure, moreover, says that Mary is called the gate of heaven, because *no one can enter heaven* if he does not pass *through Mary, who is the door of it.*" (P. 177.)

"Open to us, O Virgin, heaven, for *thou hast the keys of it.* Nay, thou art even *the gate of it, as the holy Church names thee, 'Janua cœli.'*" (P. 278.)

We omit numerous passages declaring that she is the "propitiatory" or mercy-seat, the "ark of the covenant," the "ladder of paradise," "the most true mediatrix between God and men," the doctrine

being "that Jesus Christ is the only *mediator of justice*," but that "the great privilege has been granted to Mary to be the *mediatrix of salvation*; not, indeed, mediatrix of justice, *but of grace*." (P. 169.) We shall conclude our quotations in support of our third proposition with the following:

"O woman, blessed among all women, thou art the honor of the human race, the *salvation* of our people. Thou hast a *merit that has no limits*, and an *entire power* over all creatures. Thou art the mother of God, the mistress of the world, the Queen of heaven. Thou art the *dispenser of all graces*, the *glory* of the *holy Church*. Thou art the example of the just, the consolation of the saints, and the *source of our salvation*. Thou art the joy of paradise, the *gate of heaven*, the *glory of God*." (P. 673.)

We need not offer a single word of comment. We address intelligent readers, and such can not fail to see that according to this Church, in its most devout and solemn utterances, Mary is the only hope and refuge, the only dependence, the only source of salvation, the only dispenser of grace, the only mediatrix of salvation, the only propitiatory, the only throne of grace, and hence, necessarily, the *only Savior*. If this *woman* fails to save, Romanists have no hope. May God open their eyes to see that Jesus Christ is the only Savior, and that there is no other name under the whole heavens given among men by which we can be saved. (Acts iv, 12.)

We shall occupy but little space in proving our remaining propositions. We have said that the Catholic Church teaches

4. THAT MARY IS OMNIPOTENT.

This would follow as a necessary consequence from the doctrine which we have already considered. But it may be well to show that the Church does not shrink from this consequence, but boldly and unequivocally avows it.

"Do not say that thou canst not aid me, for I know that *thou art omnipotent*, and dost obtain whatever thou desirest from God." (P. 78.)

"O Lady, protect me, this is all I ask. If thou dost protect me I fear nothing. I do not fear the demons, for thou art *more powerful* than *all the spirits of hell*; nor *my sins*, for *one word of thine* in my behalf can obtain pardon of them all from God. If I have thy favor I do not fear *even the anger of God*, for he is appeased by one prayer of thine. In a word, if thou dost protect me, I hope all things, because *all things are possible with thee*." (P. 199.)

"Says St. Peter Damian, *the Virgin has all power in heaven as on earth*." (P. 201.)

"Yes, *Mary is omnipotent*, adds Richard of St. Laurence, since the queen, by every law, must enjoy the same privileges as the king. For as *the power of the Son and mother are the same*, the mother by the omnipotent Son is made

omnipotent. And St. Antoninus says: God has placed the whole Church, not only under the patronage, but also under the dominion of Mary." (P. 203.)

"Holy Virgin, mother of God, succor those who implore thy assistance. Turn to us. But, *having been deified*, as it were, hast thou forgotten men? Ah, certainly not! Thou knowest in what peril thou hast left us, and the wretched condition of thy *servants*; no, it is not befitting a mercy so great, to forget so great misery as ours. Turn to us with thy power, because he who is powerful hath given thee *omnipotence in heaven and on earth. To thee nothing is impossible.*" (P. 331.)

The extracts introduced under our third proposition anticipated in part the proof of the fifth, namely:

5. MARY IS QUEEN OF THE UNIVERSE.

It will, however, be proper to introduce two or three brief passages more, to confirm what has already been incidentally introduced.

"Continue, Mary, continue in security to reign; dispose *according to thy will* of every thing belonging to thy Son, for thou, being mother and spouse of the King of the world, the *kingdom* and power *over all creatures* is *one* to thee as queen." (P. 26.)

"As she is the mother of the Lord of paradise, she is with reason, also, says Rupert, the Lady of paradise. *She possesses, by right, the whole kingdom* of her Son." (P. 280.)

"Make us on earth thy faithful servants, that we may thus go to bless thee in paradise. On this day, when thou hast been made *queen of the universe*, we also consecrate ourselves to thy service." (P. 514.)

But two propositions remain to be established, namely:

6. THAT GOD HIMSELF IS UNDER OBLIGATION, AND IS INDEBTED TO MARY.

7. THAT HER PETITIONS ARE REALLY COMMANDS TO GOD.

We shudder while writing these horrid sentiments. But a stern requirement of duty to God and to man leaves us no election. The time has come when the inner temple of Catholicism must be opened to the inspection of the world, that all may see it as it is, and that those who embrace it may know *what* they embrace. Hence we ask our readers, however they may loathe and detest the abominable utterances which follow, to *read* them, and to *remember* them.

"Nothing resists thy power, since thy Creator and ours, while he honors thee as his mother, considers thy glory as his own, and exulting in it as a son, grants thy petitions as if he were *discharging an obligation*. . . . Though Mary is under an infinite obligation to her Son for having elected her to be his mother, yet it can not be denied that the Son also is *greatly indebted to his mother* for having given him his human nature; whence Jesus, as if to recompense Mary *as he ought*, while he enjoys this his glory, honors her especially by always graciously listening to her prayers." (Pp. 33, 34.)

"The Son has so great regard for the prayers of Mary, and so great a desire to please her, that when she prays, she seems *to command rather than request*, and to be a *mistress* rather than a *handmaid*." (P. 202.)

"St. Bernardine of Sienna does not hesitate to say that *all obey the commands of Mary, EVEN GOD HIMSELF*." (P. 202.)

"The blessed Albertus Magnus represents Mary speaking thus: 'I must be asked to wish, for if I wish *it must be done*.'" (P. 204.)

"The Abbot Godfrey says that Mary, *although she obtains favors by praying*, yet prays with a kind of *maternal authority*." (P. 208.)

"The prayers of the blessed Virgin, being the prayers of a mother, have a *certain kind of authority*; hence it is *impossible* that she should not be heard when she prays." (P. 209.)

"St. George, Archbishop of Nicomedia, even adds, that Jesus Christ grants to his mother all her petitions, as if to satisfy *the obligation that he is under to her* for having caused by her consent that the human race should be given him. Wherefore, St. Methodius, the martyr, exclaims: 'Rejoice, O Mary, that a son has fallen to thy lot as *thy debtor*, who gives to all and receives from none.'" (P. 210.)

"She knows so well how to appease the Divine justice with her tender and wise entreaties, that God himself blesses her for it, and, as it were, *thanks her*, that thus she restrains him from abandoning and punishing them as they deserve." (P. 220.)

"Rejoice, O mother and handmaid of God! rejoice! rejoice! thou hast *for a debtor* him to whom all creatures owe their being. We are all debtors to God, *but God is a debtor to thee*." (P. 327.)

We conclude our testimonies with an extract from the prayer of St. Ephraim, which clearly *deifies* the Virgin:

"I salute thee, O great mediatrix of peace between men and God; O mother of Jesus our Lord, the love of all men and of God; *to thee be honor and blessing with the Father and with the Holy Spirit. Amen*." (P. 781.)

We have no heart for commenting upon these extracts, and, indeed, no comment is necessary. Their meaning is plain, and their doctrine unmistakable. No intelligent man can read them without being fully convinced that the Church which has produced, published, accepted, and indorsed them, actually and expressly substitutes Mary, to all intents and purposes, for the Lord Jesus Christ. Salvation, grace, mercy, pardon, refuge, hope, mediation, eternal life—every thing, in short, which a *Christian* finds in Christ, and only in Christ, the members of this Church believe they find in Mary, and *only in Mary*, consequently *not* in Christ! It is true he is regarded as having performed originally a certain part in the work of redemption, but then he retired, placing all the treasures of grace and salvation in her hands, to be dispensed according to her good pleasure, to whom she will, when she will, and as she will. Mary is *now* the

Savior, and Christ is only a Judge and Executioner. She is the mediatrix between us and his wrath, and whatever he does for us in the form of grace or mercy, he does in *obedience* to her *imperative petitions*!

We wish also to direct special attention to the fact that this is not merely what Rome *used* to hold and teach. Though this is rather an old book, and though it is made up largely of quotations from bishops and saints who lived long ago, *it is the living, present doctrine of the Romish Church in America*. How many editions since the first may have been issued in this country we have no means of knowing, but the reader will bear in mind that this, the first, edition was indorsed and *approved* by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of New York, after having been *duly examined*, as late as the year 1852!

We have not sought to give any regular and formal review of the work. It does not merit it. Its only value to a Christian is in the means it furnishes on every page for exposing the hidden mystery of Romish doctrine. And in this respect it is invaluable.

It is made up, like the portions we have exhibited, of arguments supported by quotations from saints and others, together with monstrous perversions of Holy Scripture, to prove the peculiar and transcendent glories of Mary as "set forth in the great prayer of the *Salve Regina* approved by the Church," interspersed with prayers and devotional exercises "most in use by the servants of Mary, and *approved by the Church*." It should be added that the work furnishes a contribution to history by informing us that St. Ann was the mother, and St. Joachim the father, of the Virgin. It also treats us with a detailed and circumstantial account of her post-biblical life, of her death, ascension, and coronation. As for the "examples" of *surprising* blessings secured by those who have had recourse to this "*divine mother*," they are exceedingly numerous, but none of these have we thought worthy of transcribing.

In conclusion, we would earnestly advise those of our readers who may have occasion (as who of us may not?) to encounter Catholicism before the people, to procure, if they *possibly can*, a copy of this wonderful book. We assure them that in Father Hecker's works, and others, which are *designed for Protestants*, they will find very little, if any, of the doctrine which is taught here. The "*Aspirations of Nature*," a work written to make converts to Catholicism, and

professedly stating its doctrine, will be searched in vain for such sentiments as abound every-where in the "Glories of Mary."

We infer, from this fact, that Catholicism is deceiving itself, and, temporarily, deceiving the public, as to its prospective strength in this country. All that is necessary to defeat it is for Protestants to carry out consistently their fundamental and distinctive principles, while they unveil the false prophet and disclose to their fellow-men the hideous visage beneath. *Americans will never accept the doctrines which we have portrayed in this article!* And Rome herself can not, because she *dare* not, change them. They are fixed, stereotyped, and unalterable. Secure the book in which they are contained, and hold the Jesuits and their Church to them.

IV.—THE ROYAL PRIESTHOOD.

THE priestly function is not peculiar to any nation or age. Through the mediation of the priest, the human heart has ever intuitively sought to bridge the chasm between the Holy One and fallen man. No effort of genius has ever, or can ever, take from the conscience of humanity the necessity of this mediation. It will not avail the skeptic to say it is a relic of the barbarous ages; for, alike with the roving tribes of Asia, and the ignorant hordes of Africa, the most enlightened minds of Europe and America have felt this truth, and acknowledged its necessity. The false philosophies, sciences, and civilizations of those ages have long since been discarded; but the combined efforts of infidelity, adorned by the greatest genius, and wielding the logic and rhetoric of every age, have only served to deepen this universal conviction.

Whence, then, the priestly office? Human wisdom could not have originated it; but, when once revealed, the necessities of man's fallen nature impelled him, intuitively and forever, to appropriate it. How one sinful creature can become the sanctified and accepted mediator between his fellows and the Just and Holy One is far

beyond the ken of human vision. But when that Holy One, by his own will and ceremonial law, sanctifies to himself a holy priesthood, the heart intuitively accepts it as the divine basis of human redemption, and hence the only hope of a lost and fallen world.

The first intimation of a priesthood that we have in the Word of God is in connection with him whose order was destined to become illustrious throughout the cycles of time. Melchisedec is called "King of Salem, and priest of the most high God"—a royal priest to whom even Abraham paid tithes. Again, in the days of Joseph, we read of Potipherah, priest of On, or Heliopolis, in Egypt; and of the priests generally, as a distinct and greatly-honored class in that country. Afterward, we read of "Jethro, priest of Midian," who so kindly received and entertained the future lawgiver of Israel. During all this period, we find no divine statute consecrating any family or class to the priestly order. Nor was the sacerdotal office reckoned among the rights of primogeniture, as some suppose. These the Scripture itself limits to preëminence among the brethren, and a double portion of the inheritance. (1 Chron. v, 1-4.) In the patriarchal age, while no one was forbid the altar, yet the father, by common consent, and of right, as the head of the family, stood before God and interceded in behalf of his children. As families grew into nations, kings, as national heads, and for the same reasons, sometimes, and especially upon great festive occasions, performed priestly duties. But we are not to conclude, from all this, that God did not signify his choice and divine acceptance of his faithful priests, else, whence the glory and renown of Melchisedec, not only among his own people, but among all the nations of Asia? By his providences, God had marked him as the "blessed of the Lord," "the priest of the most high God." During this dispensation every man could build his own altar, and offer thereon his sacrifices. There was no tabernacle, with its consecrated altar, upon which all sacrifices must be offered. The humble worshiper of God might build his altar upon Ararat, in the grove of Mamre, or in the vale of Shechem, and offer there his sacrifices.

But, in the lapse of time, the tabernacle is spread, and the brazen altar erected. God has chosen a people from among the nations of the earth, and a new order of priesthood must be consecrated, in harmony with the divine economy now established. Jehovah proposed now to dwell in person among his people, to manifest his

presence in the house to be built for him. It was proper that the house in which God should dwell should be built in accordance with his own designs; hence Moses built it exactly after the pattern shown him in the mount. But now that the tabernacle is set up, the glory of God is descended upon it, and his shekinah is within, whose feet shall now tread those sacred precincts, consecrated by the glory of his presence? Evidently only his chosen and consecrated priesthood. Of the twelve tribes, he chose that of Levi to minister to him, and for the people, in sacred things; and, from this tribe, the family of Aaron to officiate in the tabernacle.

It is foreign to our present purpose to institute any inquiry as to the reason of Jehovah's choice. Suffice it to say, that the same God who called Israel from the nations, also called out of Israel this tribe and family, and consecrated them to the priestly office.

To this priestly order, then, as the type of another and more enduring one, we invite attention for a time.

First: *Their qualifications.* The purity, perfection, and holiness of their calling were indicated by all the outward and bodily ceremonies of the law concerning the priesthood. Every thing tended to impress the fact that they were separated from the world—set apart to God. 1st. They were to have no bodily defilements whatever. Only a perfect and unblemished body could stand before the Lord. 2d. They were to serve in the tabernacle only during the strength and vigor of manhood. Neither the feebleness of childhood, nor old age, was tolerated within its holy precincts. 3d. They were to avoid every occasion of bodily defilement, such as contact with the dead, except in cases of near relationship; cutting and disfiguring the beard, as in times of mourning; marrying a woman of bad fame, or one that had been divorced; and the high-priest, as being in his own person the most sacred, was still further restricted, in that he was not to defile himself even for his father and mother, and should marry only a virgin. 4th. Their garments of white linen, promoting cleanliness, as the use of them always does, indicated purity of life; hence, the white garments of the heavenly inhabitants are, in the language of revelation, expressly declared to mean "the righteousness of saints." For this reason, also, the pure white robes worn by the high-priest on the day of atonement are called the "garments of holiness," and upon his miter was written, "Holiness to the Lord."

Second: *The Consecration.* They were taken to the door of the tabernacle, and their bodies washed in the waters of the laver, the priestly garments put upon them, and their heads anointed with oil—the washing in the cleansing element of water again indicating purity of soul and life, and the anointing with oil declaring them to be chosen of God and consecrated to his service. But all these external purifications only served to reveal to them the immeasurable distance between themselves and the Holy One, in whose presence they were about to stand. They were now, in some degree, at least, prepared to comprehend the necessity for the blood of Atonement. This again was provided in such a manner as not only to impress them with its necessity, but also with a vivid consciousness of the absolute purity of those who would serve at the altar of Jehovah. “For first of all there was presented, for the expiation of sin, the bullock of sin-offering, of which nothing save a little fat was offered, (on the altar,) because the offerers were not yet worthy to have any gift or offering accepted by God. But after they had been so far purged, they slew the burnt-offering to God, which was wholly laid upon the altar. And after this came a sacrifice, like a peace-offering, (which was wont to be divided between God, the priest, and the offerers,) showing that they were now so far received into favor with God that they might eat at his table.” The blood of the victim was then sprinkled upon the altar and the priest, indicating that God accepted the life (in the blood) of the animal slain, instead of his own; the blood, also, was sprinkled upon his right ear, hand, and foot, consecrating the ear to hear the commands of God, the hand to extend offerings unto him, the foot to tread the holy precincts of his court, and hasten in the ways of his righteousness. Now, to complete the consecration, the oil and blood, commingled, were sprinkled upon him, signifying that their consecrating and cleansing influence would ever be present with him, so long as he obeyed the commandments of God. Thus, every ceremonial act of consecration displays the holiness of the Infinite One, and, at the same time, discovers the woeful depths of human degradation. Here, too, the boundless grace and mercy of God are ever present in the blood of atonement, but only attained through a priesthood consecrated in every respect as the Infinite Father has directed.

Third: *The Duties of the Priesthood.* The tribe of Levi received

no lot with the other tribes, but was wholly consecrated to the work of the Lord. To this tribe, while sojourning in the wilderness, was given in charge the tabernacle. Around it they encamped at night, and bore its various parts when traveling in the day. When, at last, they became located in Judea, it was their duty to prepare all things necessary for the temple worship, and to teach the law to the people, among whom they were located, and by whom they were supported. But to the priests were confined the duties of the sanctuary. They were the mediators between God and the people. Theirs was the duty to offer the various offerings of the ceremonial law, to officiate at the morning and evening sacrifices, and, upon the occasion of all national festivals, to keep in order all things about the temple, and unfold the law to the people. (Lev. x, 11; xxxiii, 10, and Malachi ii, 7.) The high-priest alone entered the most holy place once a year, to make atonement for the sins of the people.

To the most casual observer there are, in the Jewish priesthood, evident imperfections. The high-priest himself needed a mediator. With his people he had sinned, and, like them, he needed a sin-offering. Separated from the people, a priest unto God, and yet himself in need of a priest. Propitiating the Divine favor in behalf of Israel, and yet himself standing in the presence of God, only through the boundless grace of his infinite love. The offerings, too, were equally imperfect. No philosophy, human or divine, can demonstrate how it is possible for the blood of bulls and of goats to take away sins, or how the blood of an innocent victim can propitiate Deity. But these are imperfections, that must ever attach to all merely human priesthoods. The Divine Wisdom alone can supply the deficiency. The consciousness of this fact lay hold upon the sweet Psalmist of Israel, when he said: "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thy enemies. Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power, in the beauties of holiness from the womb of the morning: thou hast the dew of thy youth. The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent. Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec." In this, and other Jewish Scriptures, a new order of priesthood is plainly indicated. Still, strange to say, this pretension to the priestly function is the very rock over which the Jews stumbled when they

crucified the Lord of Glory, and which ever after proved a stumbling-block to many Hebrew Christians.

Against these claims of the Christ, two grave objections presented themselves to the Jewish mind: 1. Coming of Juda's tribe, how can he be a priest of Aaron's order? 2. If not of that order, then his is a new one, and without authority. Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, meets these difficulties. He frankly admits that Christ could not belong to the Levitical priesthood; for, "he sprang from Juda, of which tribe Moses spoke nothing concerning the priesthood." (Heb. vii, 14.) Besides, if, on earth, he could not minister at that altar, seeing there is a distinct order appointed by the law, and this order is taken from another tribe, (Heb. viii,) by what right then does he claim to be a priest? By Divine right—the call of God himself, the Apostle replies. "No one takes this honor to himself, but he that is called by God, as Aaron also was called. So, also, the Christ did not take upon himself the honor of becoming a high-priest; but he gave him this honor who said to him, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee; as he says, also, in another place, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec." (Heb. v, 4-6.) Again: "He is made a priest not according to the law of a fleshly commandment, but according to the power of an endless life. For he testifies thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec." (Heb. vii, 16-17.) Again: "He is made such by the oath of the living God, which can not be said of Aaron's order." Thus, from their own Scriptures, he demonstrates the necessity for another order of priesthood. These Scriptures find their fulfillment in Christ, and the order in which he is high-priest.

This new order, while in many particulars it resembles the former, yet, in its essential characteristics, is altogether superior to it. It is a royal priesthood. This high-priest is possessed of power and authority. We no longer listen for the sound of the bells upon his robes to assure us that he lives while standing in the midst of the *shekinah* of God. His is an unchangeable priesthood, and he lives and abides forever to make intercession for the saints.

Made a priest by the "oath of God," and "the power of an endless life," he entered upon his official duties, not because of lineal descent, but because of the eternal fitness of things. In his person the necessary defects of the former priesthood are done away. He

alone of all born of women is spotlessly pure. He alone can stand with unveiled face in the *sanctum sanctorum* of the universe. Sinless, he needs no sin-offering for himself, no priest to stand between him and his Father in heaven. What a glorious high-priest is this—our brother, tempted as we are tempted, and yet without sin; and, also, our Redeemer and King, who lives and abides forever! Nor does he enter the most holy place without the blood of atonement; yet not the blood of bulls and goats, which can not cleanse from sin, but by his own precious blood, shed for the remission of the sins of many. Thus the Divine Wisdom has presented a perfect mediation through the Son of Mary—the Son of God—as human as his mother, as divine as his father—a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec.

Now, since in him we “live, and move, and have our being,” and our “life is hid with Christ in God,” we, too, are royal priests with him; having been consecrated and brought near to God, “an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ,” we are constituted in him “a chosen race, a royal priesthood.” Christ “hast redeemed us to God by his blood, out of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us to our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth.”

To conclude the argument, the apostle declares that to have been simply the type of this, the services of the Jewish tabernacle only “copies” of the things in the heavens. To this typical relation we invite attention for a time:

1. As the people of Israel could approach their God only through the mediation of Aaron and his sons, so now we can only come to God through Jesus the Christ. Thus has God ordained; and the result of Korah's rebellion should teach the Roman priest the infamy of his pretension, and the inevitable doom that awaits him. Christ is the one Mediator, and no man can come to God but through him.

2. The sacrifices, consecrations, garments, purifications by water and blood, were all typical of the personal holiness of Christ, only his was not acquired, but original, inherent holiness. He was the “lamb without spot or blemish,” covered from his youth with a spotless garment of righteousness.

3. The high-priest entering the most holy place with the names of the twelve tribes upon his breast, typified Christ entering heaven, bearing his people upon his heart before the throne of God.

4. The clear and perfect revelation of the Father's will was prefigured by the *Urim* and *Thummim* of the Jewish high-priest, "through which the priesthood gave auricular decisions in regard to the things of God." In short, the covenant of Sinai was typical of a better covenant, and all the ceremonies of the tabernacle service "copies of the things in the heavens." (Heb. ix, x.)

5. We conclude, then, with great confidence, that the consecration and anointing of the Aaronic priesthood was typical of the consecration and anointing of the Christian priesthood. It would be strange, indeed, if it were not so. That which preceded and which came after the anointing was typical; then, why not the anointing itself? Indeed, the "various immersions" spoken of by the apostle in this chapter, constitute a part of the consecrating ceremony.

We have already invited attention to the order of consecration peculiar to the Jewish priesthood. They were washed in the laver, their garments put upon them, their heads anointed with oil, the sacrifices offered, and the consecration completed by the blood of sprinkling.

For the fulfillment of all righteousness, whether exhibited in positive commands, or in the shadows of the Law, the body of Christ was washed in the laver of baptism, and the heavens opening, he was anointed Prophet, Priest, and King, by the descending Spirit of God. Unlike Aaron, he needed no sprinkling of blood upon himself. One with the Father, he had no Divine favor to propitiate. Sinless, he had no guilt to cleanse, but with his own blood he entered the most holy place, once for all, to make atonement for the human family. Christ was anointed Priest at his baptism.

Against these conclusions the following objections will be urged :

1. An objection based upon Heb. vii, 11, 17. "If, then, there had been a perfect expiation by means of the Levitical priesthood, (for with reference to it the people received the law,) what further need was there that another priest should be raised up after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron? It is evident that, when the priesthood is changed, there is of necessity, also, a change of the law. For He of whom these things are said belongs to another tribe, from which no one attended upon the altar. For it is very clear that our Lord sprung from Juda, of which tribe Moses spoke nothing concerning the priesthood." There can be no valid

objection based upon this passage. Some of the Jewish Christians taught that the law of Moses had not been abrogated, and was therefore binding still upon all the followers of Christ. Paul meets this declaration by pointing to their own Scriptures, which declared that God would raise up a "new order" of priesthood. That Christ was a priest, they themselves acknowledged; but that he could not belong to the Levitical priesthood was evident, for he came from the wrong tribe; but is, rather, a royal priest after the order of Melchisedec. Hence, the priesthood being changed, there is of necessity a change of the law. This is the logical conclusion of the apostle. That he was a priest *then* is conclusively demonstrated. This, and no more, upon that question.

2. Heb. viii, 1-7: "Now, concerning the things that have been spoken, the principal point is this: We have such a high-priest, who has taken his seat at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the holy places, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man. For every high-priest is appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore, it is necessary that this one also have something which he may offer. For if he were on earth, he could not be a priest; because there are priests who offer gifts according to the law: and these serve the copy and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle. See now, says he, that you make all things according to the pattern shown you in the Mount. But now he has obtained a more excellent ministry, inasmuch as he is the Mediator of a better covenant, which is established with reference to better promises."

The apostle, in this context, declares the tabernacle erected by Moses to be "the copy and shadow of heavenly things;" that Christ serves "a minister of the holy places, and of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man." He does not serve in the former, and if he were on earth he could not be a priest in that line and serve in that tabernacle. But why not? Because there are already priests that offer gifts according to the law. This Christ could not do if on earth, for, as we have already seen, he does not come from the right tribe. Hence the conclusion: He has obtained a more excellent ministry, inasmuch as he is the Mediator of a better covenant, which is established with reference to better promises.

This is clearly the logical import of the apostle's argument, and beyond this we can not legitimately press the interpretation.

3. Heb. i, 9: "Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, thy God, has anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." This prophecy the apostle applies directly to the Savior; and, indeed, it is applicable to none other. If it be said that the anointing was a completed event when the prophecy was first uttered, the conclusion is fatal to the objector. If, as it most certainly was, the anointing was yet a future event, then this passage does not throw any light upon the time and place of the anointing, and hence the objection based upon it is invalid.

4. Acts ii, 36: "Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God has made this same Jesus, whom you crucified, both Lord and Christ."

This passage simply forms the conclusion of a grand argument in demonstration of the Messiahship, which the apostle has just completed, but the time and place of the anointing the context does not determine.

5. Finally, it is urged that he did not begin at once to officiate as priest, and could not, until the Jewish sacrifices had ceased. This we readily grant, but the conclusion does not affect the fact that he was anointed priest at his baptism. Time, indeed, elapsed between the anointing and the beginning of his official work, but the Old Testament Scriptures abound in illustrations entirely similar. The Lord sent Elijah from Horeb, on the way to the wilderness of Damascus, to anoint Hazael to be king over Syria; Jehu, the son of Nimshi, to be king over Israel; and Elisha to be prophet in his stead. Elijah faithfully fulfilled the commands of the Lord, but long years supervened before either of these anointed ones began their official work. It was at least seven years after this before Elijah was taken up to heaven, and left his mantle with Elisha; and it was, probably, twice that time before the death of the kings of Syria and Israel gave room for Hazael and Jehu to assume the scepters of their respective kingdoms. Long years of trials, likewise, intervened after the son of Jessie was anointed king, before the shepherd of Bethlehem assumed the royal purple. So with his illustrious anti-type, "the Prince of the house of David." He was anointed at his baptism, but three years of bitter trial had passed away when he

began his work as priest; and the rending of the veil indicated the abolishment of the Levitical priesthood.

In confirmation of this proposition we submit the following proofs:

1. Luke iv, 17-21: "And the volume of Isaiah the prophet was given to him: and when he had unrolled the volume, he found the place where it was written: The Spirit of the Lord is upon me; because he has anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor; he has sent me to heal the broken-hearted; to proclaim liberty to the captives; and recovery of sight to the blind; to set free the oppressed; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord. . . . And he began to say to them: This scripture which you have heard is this day fulfilled."

Here the Master declares himself to be already anointed to do a work which necessarily involved the priestly function. That is, "to heal the broken-hearted; to proclaim liberty to the captives; and recovery of sight to the blind; to set free the oppressed;" but without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins, no such thing as setting free the oppressed or giving liberty to the captives. Hence, we conclude, with positive certainty, that he had, in this early period of his ministry, been anointed to offer the sacrifice of atonement, to shed his blood for the remission of the sins of many; but only a priest can accomplish this work.

2. Acts x, 36-38: "The word which he sent to the sons of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ, (he is Lord of all,) that word, you know, which was published through the whole of Judea, beginning from Galilee, after the immersion that John preached—how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power." The "word" sent to the sons of Israel, and which was published through the whole of Judea, was that God had anointed Jesus. But where was this word published? It began in Galilee, after John's immersion. Why had it not been proclaimed before? Because God had not before anointed him. Why proclaimed just after John's immersion? Because at his immersion he was anointed with the Holy Spirit and with power. This is absolutely certain, and since there is not a single intimation, in all the book, of any other anointing, we conclude that he was here anointed Prophet, Priest, and King.

3. In his confession, Peter said: "Thou art *the* Anointed, the Son of the living God"—the Prophet, Priest, and King. Thou *art* the Anointed; not will be, but art now. This is simply exhaustive. There can be no other anointed one, no other anointing. "Upon this truth I will build my Church." But if the priestly function constitutes no part of that truth, then his priestly relation constitutes no part of the foundation. Hence we conclude again that he was the anointed priest.

4. "I adjure you by the living God, that you tell us whether you are the Christ, the Son of the living God?" "Jesus said to him: You have said." Under oath he affirmed himself *the* Anointed of God, the Prophet, Priest, and King. This ought to be conclusive.

5. Into the first tabernacle the high-priest went *not*, until he was anointed, and then not without blood. (Heb. ix.) Even so *the Anointed* entered the most holy place, not without the blood of atonement, which he sprinkled upon the mercy-seat. But only the consecrated and anointed priest of God could have offered that spotless lamb, or stood with the "blood of sprinkling" in the presence of the eternal One. We conclude, then, that Christ was anointed priest at his baptism, and began his work as such, when he offered himself upon the cross, and with his own blood entered the heavens to make atonement for the sins of the world.

We have already seen that all the service of the first tabernacle was typical of the service in the true. In the former service the high-priest was washed in the brazen laver, his priestly garments put upon him, his head anointed with oil, and then declared symbolically sanctified by the sprinkling of the blood of atonement. In the true tabernacle services, our great High-Priest was washed in the laver of baptism, and anointed by the Spirit of God descending upon him. He needed no robes of righteousness, for these had ever been around him, nor did he need any sprinkling of the blood of atonement, for sinless he stood in the presence of the universe.

That the washing of the laver was typical of baptism is, we think, demonstrable, if the whole service of the tabernacle was a type of the Christian economy. Altars in that dispensation were typical of altars in this; sacrifices of sacrifices; blood of blood; sprinklings of sprinklings; pourings of pourings; and washings of washings. In that dispensation blood, or its substitute, ashes mingled with water,

was sprinkled upon the parties to be cleansed. Water alone was never sprinkled upon any one by divine authority. So now, in the New Testament, we read of the sprinkling of blood, (Heb. x, 22 ; xii, 24,) but never of water. There also the blood was poured out upon the altar ; even so, the blood of the Redeemer was poured out upon Calvary for the sins of the world. In that economy their bodies were washed wholly in water ; so now in this also. In that the oil of anointing was poured on Aaron's head, and ran down upon his beard, even upon his garments ; so in this the Holy Spirit was poured out upon Christ without measure, "anointing him with the oil of gladness above his fellows."

Again : that the washing of the laver was typical of baptism is positively affirmed by Dr. Fairbairn, of Glasgow, the greatest of all expounders of Scriptural types. In proof of the proposition he quotes the following (Heb. x, 22) : "Having their bodies washed in pure water," "where (he says) the symbolic language is entirely retained." Again (Titus iii, 5) : "The washing of regeneration," and (Ephes. v, 26), "Sanctified and cleansed by the washing of water, by the Word."

As Aaron was inducted into the priestly office, so were all the Levitical priests. We also are a "royal priesthood," "kings and priests" with Christ. As he was consecrated and anointed, even so we also should be consecrated.

He was washed—went down into the Jordan, and came up out of it again. We also must be washed. But we, being sinners, must have put on the priestly robes of righteousness, without which we could not officiate at the altar ; but "he is our righteousness," hence "as many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." In both dispensations the candidate attained to his priestly robes through the washing of the laver, and by baptism respectively.

Again : as in the former service, all things were cleansed by blood, so, in this, "we come to the blood of sprinkling, that speaks better things than the blood of Abel ;" but when do we come to this "sprinkling of blood?" Certainly not until we come into the death of Christ. "Know you not that as many of you as were baptized into Christ Jesus, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him, by baptism, into death." The Jewish priest passed through the washing of the laver to the sprinkling, we through the

waters of baptism ; hence, "draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water."

Finally, as Christ was anointed with the Holy Spirit after baptism, so we receive the gift of the Holy Spirit after baptism. Christ went down into the Jordan, and came up out of it. The force of his example is deeply felt by the religious world, hence the constant effort made to break it. Christ's baptism, we are told, is no example to us, for, unlike us, he had no sins to be forgiven. True, but he was to become our great high-priest, and this, in harmony with the fulfillment of all righteousness, could not be, unless his body was first washed in the laver of baptism.

Are we, then, consecrated priests? If not, how dare we officiate at the altar? Have our bodies been washed in the laver of baptism? Have we gone down into the tide and come up out of it as did the Savior? If not, let the fate of Korah and his companions be a warning to us. If, in the type, men perished because they approached the altar without consecration, how much greater their punishment in the antitype?

Christ's immersion is, then, indeed, an example to us. Then let me stand, like the blessed Savior, on "Jordan's strand;" yea, let me put my feet in the tracks he left in its yielding sands; like him, lie beneath its liquid wave, and rise with him, a royal "priest forever."

V.—CHRISTOLOGY.

WE beg the reader not to be offended at the heading of this article, if the word be not familiar to his ears. It may, to some, sound a little learned, and even smack a little of vain philosophy, but it is a legitimate word; it has a noble parentage, and has been naturalized in strict accordance with all the statutes in such cases made and provided.

We may be compelled to use, in the discussion we propose, several words which we could wish were more familiar to many of our readers; words which have among us long been under ban, from a misapprehension of their proper meaning, and probably more from a wrong view of the things they signify. Words are signs, and, in order to their correct use, we must regard not only the sign itself, but also the thing signified, and the suitableness of the former to clearly express the latter.

Let no one conclude, from these prefatory remarks, that we are about to talk of words rather than of things; albeit words are things. Not at all; we have no taste for logomachy, and if we had, the subject which for a time is to engage our attention is of such transcendent interest and importance that we can not for a moment think of losing sight of it in the mazes of mere philological disquisition. To give a popular air to what we have to say, we shall use terms in common use, as far as the ideas we wish to bring before the mind can be set forth in language not strictly scientific. The learned reader will appreciate the difficulty of our undertaking, and make, we hope, due allowance for it.

Christology, Theology, Philosophy, are words of pregnant meaning; they stand for realms of thought that may well engage our profoundest attention, and evoke all our power. These themes are connected with our dearest interests for time and eternity. The deep things of revelation, of being, of reason; the problems of divinity and humanity, and the union of these in one glorious person; the conduct of life in its nature, relations, and purposes, and our destiny forever, as redeemed from sin and death, are included, to some

extent, in the clear apprehension of what, in every intelligent mind, is set forth by these words, when properly understood. Whence, then, the prejudice against them—I will not say against the things they signify—that has possessed the minds of many well-meaning people? They sound learned, we admit; but an apology is at hand, and will suggest itself to even the casual reader. Can any other words represent the ideas they stand for as well? We think not. In the sentence which has just dropped from our pen occurs the word *apology*, really not less learned, nor dissimilar in derivation; but it is the best word for our purpose, and we use it without offense. But though Christology, Theology, and Philosophy be learned words, we trust their meaning is known and loved by all who may feel interest enough in them to read this article. The conceptions these words represent relate to the Divinity of our Lord, to God himself, and to the nature of being; and surely these are legitimate subjects of human thought, if entered upon in humble reliance on Divine assistance, diffidence of our own powers, and a supreme respect for the teachings of Holy Scripture.

Certain schools, sacred and secular, have so far speculated upon these noble themes in a dogmatic spirit; and without taking the teachings of the inspired Word into the account, that great confusion of thought, skepticism, and almost all forms of error, have resulted; so that simple minds have been scandalized, and the cause of Christ injured. It has therefore been popular with many to declaim against Philosophy, Theology, and, it may be, even against Christology. Paul himself is gravely cited as condemning Philosophy, without its being noted that it is a vain and empty philosophy that is the object of his condemnation. His censuring of philosophy as it existed in his day—and employed by Greek and Roman sophists on the most puerile questions—could not, without a manifest paralogism, be made to hold against the science that deals with the deepest problems of the human spirit, of reason, and of being; and with the correlation of these according to the formal laws of thought. The same prejudice—*mutatis mutandis*—and for like reasons, is entertained against Theology, natural and revealed; while the fact is, we can not think at all upon the works and words of God without forming to ourselves a theology either true or false; and as we must, if we exercise the God-given prerogative of thought at all, have some

sort of a Christology, Theology, and Philosophy, we take it that we ought to strive to attain the truth in all these departments, so far as may be in our power, and without regard to mere verbal controversy.

It is supposed by many that because Being, Christ, and God are transcendent, that is, in their ultimate ground beyond the reach of the human reason, *à priori*, all inquiries into these great themes are daring and fruitless. But we maintain that while Revelation goes far beyond the reason, and makes known much above, it makes known nothing contrary to the reason; and therefore there is a proper field for the exercise of the latter in formulating the ideas of the former, and thus leading us to a clear apprehension of these Divine verities, confirming our faith, and enabling us to meet the infidel objectors to our holy religion on their own ground.

We lay it down as a proposition susceptible of proof, that a Scriptural Christology is a condition precedent to a reasonable Theology, and that both of these condition a consistent Philosophy. By condition, here, we mean what is strictly such in distinction from what is properly called a cause. "One thing is said to be a condition of another, when its presence and influence are necessary, not that that other may obtain existence and its essential attributes, but that it may unfold and perfect itself according to the laws of its own being."*

Assuming the historic Christ, we contend that any Theology that denies his essential divinity and his incarnation can not commend itself to our reason, but, on the contrary, will, when fairly tested, appear most unreasonable. It may be set forth in most eloquent phrase, and come to us in the garments of taste—may appeal to our love of the esthetical, and even in some degree awaken in us the "enthusiasm of humanity"—but when examined in its ground and essential principles, it will be found false and deceptive. So that now, with men living where the Gospel has been proclaimed, and, in fact, in all lands, the question must be, not between it and another religion, but between it and no religion at all. If Christ be not the second Adam—the generic man—and his religion able to supplant all others, then all religions are founded in error, and are perpetuated by the cunning of the few taking advantage of the credulity of the many. The man who, with a fair presentation of Christ's religion

* See "Gerhard's Philosophy," *passim*.

before him, examines it, weighs its evidences, looks at it as a whole, and tests the consistency of its parts, scrutinizes its spirit and tendency, and then at the bar of reason presents a verdict of "Not proved," is prepared, and is logically required, to reject all religion; nay, more, must reject all reason.

And so, too, in regard to Philosophy, the science of being. Let any man attempt to construct a system which shall ignore the "Word made flesh, and dwelling among us," and he will find himself bewildered in the labyrinths of speculation without end. There will be no consistency in its parts, because there is no plastic principle cementing the whole. Having taken a wrong position—one not central—all his observations, however correctly made, and all his calculations, however exact, will fail to give a true idea of the harmony of the universe. As we can know God only as he is in Christ, reconciling the world to himself, so in Philosophy we can know the world only as viewed in its relation to Him who is its light and life. Christ, then, must correlate on the one side God, in order to a correct theology, and on the other side man, in order to a consistent philosophy. God and man must meet in Christ, in order to a true Christology; and thus he becomes the Theanthropos, whose incarnation complements the demands of our reason in respect to both theology and philosophy.

We said, awhile ago, assuming the historic Christ. But are we allowed logically to do this? Clearly we are. There he is—there are the historic testimonies concerning his birth at a certain time and place—his life of love, his miracles, his teachings, his death, his resurrection, and the mission of the apostles—the new era dating from his birth, the new religion from his death. And the question raises itself in every thoughtful mind, What are we to do with all this? It is not for the believer to worry himself meeting the cavils of unfair opponents, but for these opponents to submit some reasonable hypothesis to account for the origin and wonderful progress of Christianity, against which more and weightier objections do not lie than all that have been or ever can be urged against our faith. Take Jesus of Nazareth, say we, and dispose of him in a way to satisfy the demands of historical criticism. The skeptic has had eighteen centuries for this task—it has never been done, and we are very confident it never will—but till this be done, we are entitled to our

assumption ; and it is all we need to a synthesis of our system of Christology.

Philosophy has to deal with Being in its most extended sense—not this or that being, but being in its generic conception. It proposes to answer the What, the Why, and the How of being. It has to do with the abstractions, generalizations, conceptions, judgments, and reasonings pertaining to that mysterious something called being—this is its province, this its problem. Now as God, by Christ, made and now supports, and governs all things which are in heaven, and which are in earth, and which are under the earth, as the Scriptures affirm and Christ's miracles prove, how can a sound philosophy exist, we ask, that does not look to Christ as its first principle?

Theology has to do with the nature and attributes of God, not abstractly, but in his relation to us and the world. What is God? The Scriptures and reason alike respond that no finite mind can comprehend Him—that is, Him the absolute—but Him relatively to us and this creation, both unite harmoniously in declaring to be our Creator, our moral Governor, the Spirit and the Life of all things. They alike demand, in order to a rational conception of Him, the enumeration of those attributes of goodness, wisdom, and power, which, infinite in degree, immutable in essence, and eternal in duration, make up a satisfactory answer to the question, What is God? and without which any other conception must be inadequate in itself, and unsatisfactory to us.

Christology has taken for its initial problem the great question What is the relation of the Divine to the human nature in the person of Christ? This is the question of the ages ; it was the question of Christ's age ; it is, also, of ours ; and it will be of every age till he come to judge the world in righteousness. What think ye of Christ? If there be any thing of which it is emphatically true that history repeats itself, it is in relation to this question, that is made by the Lord himself the foundation of his Church, its creed, and its glory. This settled, and there remains but little about which we may care to dispute in Philosophy, Theology, or Christology.

Let us, then, try to show that the Scripture revelations of Christ are in agreement with the laws of correct thinking in these departments ; and in doing this we shall, I think, discover the common unity that pervades them all, and from which each receives its

scientific character and value. We shall find, moreover, that our reason accepts without reluctance the sublime oracle of revelation, "That in Christ all things consist," that he is the alpha and omega of all being, the first and the last, God manifest in flesh.

Philosophy is possible only on the admission of two great intuitions; these are primary truths of the understanding, simple and undefinable, above all proof, and, indeed, supersensual. These are: I am; the world is; the ego and the non-ego—the first constituting the subject, the second the object of thought. The distinction between these is essential, and to hold it fast a condition of all definite and valuable thinking. There is a being that feels, reasons, believes, knows; and there is that which is felt, reasoned, believed and known. The assurance of the reality of both these, and the relation of the one to the other as subject and object, are things of immediate cognition. We need no proof of them; they are necessary, and must be admitted. Men like Berkeley and Hume may raise questions about them, but their theory carried to its last result may be made just as well to invalidate the reality of the mind itself. Can I have any more assurance of the reality of my own mind than of something which is not my mind? Can I make a single step in the analysis of thinking, without the recognition of the fact that what thinks is one entity and the object thought about is another? We call that which thinks, knows, etc., the Reason, using this word comprehensively. It may think about itself, the world, and God. When self is the object of thought, it becomes the thinker and the thing thought, and it is called by logicians a subject-object; the mind has this immediate power of introspection, it can make itself the object of its own thought, but this does not in the least invalidate the philosophical distinction of subject and object, for the mind holds itself in thought just as it holds any thing else, and it is subject to the same laws. In like manner, when I think of the world, or any part thereof, I hold it in the mind according to the laws of thinking, and the same is true when I think of God. To know myself, the world, or God, is to hold these in the reason as they are in themselves; so that we may define "To know" the possessing an object in idea as it is in reality, or, it is the subjective existence of an objective reality. I may know much or little of particular entities, but nothing is knowledge that does not conform to this definition. It embraces as its

elements: 1. Conviction; 2. Of what is true; 3. On sufficient evidence. It is, then, more than faith, and includes it, for faith is conviction, but not necessarily of what is true; it is more than opinion, for that results from insufficient evidence. The grounds of knowledge are sense-perceptions, consciousness, and self-evident propositions.

The knowledge of self embraces two entirely distinct objects. I know I have a mind, and I know I have a body; and I know the one of these just as well as I know the other, for both are essential parts of the self-conscious me, and this is ultimate. I say my mind, my body, and I use these expressions without any hesitation. I never stop to explain, nor does any sane mind require it. But this "my," what of it? For what does it stand? Certainly not for either separately, but for both united in one personality. The argument in that wonderfully acute book, *Butler's Analogy*, for the difference between mind and matter, spirit and body, built upon the expressions my hand, my foot, my body, etc., making the my one thing and the body another, is wholly fallacious, for I can say, with equal propriety, my soul, my spirit, and my body. The fact is, all these make up the my. I am body, soul, and spirit, in one mysterious unity. I know this, but how this is so I know not, and may never know; it may be known only to Him that made me.

Using the word reason to include the soul and the spirit, it is defined by some metaphysicians as "An order of created spirit existing in vital union with a material body."* This is what I know as myself; what I may think or what I may believe in relation to a future or an intermediate state is foreign to this discussion. The reason alone is not the man; neither is the body alone, but both vitally united in one organism. The reason thinks, and it has certain forms in which the matter of its thoughts is held: there is the thing thought of, and the manner of thinking about it; then there is the union of these in the grand product; and this last results from the correspondence between subject and object, or the laws of being and the laws of thinking. Recognizing this duality in the complex being called myself, and that the parts are held in vital union, so that I am not two beings, but one being; and, furthermore, that the union is a condition of the development of each normally; that the reason develops itself through its union with the

* See "Gerhard's Philosophy," *sub voce*,

body, and the body through its union with the reason, in a way we know not, we are prepared to ask how there arises in our mind the conception of God?

Now just here we think philosophy fails, and that theology, properly so called, satisfies the yearnings of our rational nature. That, in its fallen state, unconsciously seeks after God, as all the better writings of the ancients attest. It seeks in the *phanerosis* of nature, in the world which, by the very constitution of the reason, it knows to be beyond itself, for what must ever be the subject of an *apokalupsis*. In a word, it seeks in philosophy for what belongs to theology. The Apostle Paul, in his address to the philosophic Athenians, as reported in Acts, seventeenth chapter, makes all this as lucid as the light: "Then Paul stood in the midst of Mars' hill, and said: Men of Athens, I perceive that in all respects your reverence for demons excels that of other men. For as I was passing through, and looking attentively at the objects of your worship, I discovered also an altar with this inscription: TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. Whom therefore you ignorantly worship, him I make known to you. God, who made the world, and all things that are in it, being Lord of heaven and earth, dwells not in temples made with hands; nor is he ministered to by the hands of men, as if he needed any thing; for he himself gives to all life, and breath, and all things; and he has made from one blood every nation of men, that they might dwell on all the face of the earth, having marked out their appointed times, and the bounds of their dwelling: that they might seek for God, if perhaps they would feel after him, and find him, although, indeed, he is not far from every one of us. For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as also some of your own poets have said: for we his offspring are."*

We think we have good ground for supposing that, in the normal condition of the reason, Philosophy and Theology would utter but one voice to all men, and that voice would be for one living and true God. Adam doubtless saw in himself and in the kosmos the reflected image of his Maker. As the glassy surface of the clear lake mirrors the cope of heaven with its infinity of stars, or in the light of day reflects from its unruffled plane the image of the glorious sun, but tossed and made turbid by the storm distorts every object above it, so the human reason, agitated by passion and blinded by prejudice,

* Anderson's translation.

no more, as it was wont to do, answers with a true image of God as he appeared before it ere sin had defiled the heart of man. We but express our firm belief when we affirm that the human reason, undisturbed by sin, and in union with its Maker, would *naturally* hold the conception of God even as it holds the conception of self. It is not one of the least effects of transgression that man's reason lost this power of reflecting the image of God. Only a dim remembrance of what it once possessed, and this, more and more obscured as the race was removed from Eden's blessed bowers, remained as a sad memento of his fall.

The first great purpose of revealed religion being to restore to the reason the knowledge of God, and through this to reëstablish the broken relation between God and man, it was to be expected that Revelation should begin with the most sublime oracle ever uttered: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." It is no part of God's intention to tell us *how* he made it, but *who* made it. How superfluous, then, all attempts to reconcile the as yet crude theories of geology with the simple announcement of Moses in the first chapter of Genesis! Our reason demands a Creator for this which itself declares to be a creation; it cries aloud for a God, and even says there is one, but how inadequate, how distorted, how obscure is the conception! Theology relieves Philosophy, and assuming all the latter has truly taught or can teach, it adds to it the knowledge of one living God. It does not, consequently, go over again the ground already won by the reason in the triumphs of philosophy in either physical or metaphysical science. It does not undertake to reveal what may be learned of the world and its laws, or the mind and its operations, by observation and experience. It alludes to these only so far as they come within the proper sphere of religion. Divine wisdom is nowhere more clearly united with infinite love than, having given us the capacity to think, and a universe to think about, and having established the laws according to which we may comprehend the varied relations of part to part and all to Him, he should have ordained that our faculties find employment and pleasure while we study his wonderful works. "The works of the Lord are great, sought out of all them that have pleasure therein. His work is honorable and glorious: and his righteousness endureth forever. He hath made his wonderful works to be remembered; the Lord is

gracious and full of compassion." Revelation is not concerned to make known botany, astronomy, zoölogy, or any branch of natural history ; neither does it propose to instruct us in ontology, psychology, or any of the divisions of metaphysical philosophy, but its aim is to make known God to us, because in no other way can he be known as we ought to know him. It is thus that the circle of our knowledge is made complete as far as relates to the Creator and his works. His moral government over men and nations was added, as far as it could be, to the partially-developed reason of the old world, in the communications he made to the patriarchs and prophets, and through the law and its ordinances. The revelation of God, till the coming of our Lord, is properly called theology. Its first principle is, There is one God.

Christology does what neither philosophy nor mere theology could do—it teaches that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." Paul says: "There is one God." That is theology, as far as it goes. And he adds, "and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." This latter is Christology. Disobedience to God had disturbed the relations between him, his creature, and his creation ; to link again God and man and nature in a blessed bond of peace was the benevolent purpose of Christ's incarnation. He, the *Maker* of all, assumes not the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham, and comes into the world to reconcile all things to himself. The antagonisms aroused by sin are to be overcome ; the beautiful harmony of sinless natures is to be restored ; the majesty of the divine law is to be vindicated ; sin punished ; man made holy, and consequently happy ; and the disorders introduced into this world remedied. Death is the result of sin. What a change, then, must have been made in humanity and nature when it became active in the bodies of the first transgressors ! How worthy the intervention of God ; how consonant with the character of Christ to interpose to arrest death, to restore, through redemption, the ruined children of the common Father of all to divine fellowship and eternal life !

To accomplish this a revelation above nature and above the reason of man was needed. Christ is that revelation. From the first appearance of God to Adam, till the glorious visions on Patmos, all the manifestations of Divine wisdom, all the operations of infinite power, all the achievements of boundless love culminate in the Alpha

and Omega, the Beginning and End of the creation of God. He is the organic unity of humanity and divinity, and hence a true idea of both is to be derived from him, and can not be evolved from nature or from reason. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, hath declared him," and thus we know God and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent, which is the beginning of a new life, and that life is eternal.

The great question, then, for us is, What do the Scriptures teach concerning the Christ? We hold that their teaching is in accord with a rational philosophy and theology; not that either of these could of itself suggest or explain the Christological problem, but given the incarnation of Christ, as made known in the New Testament, they both obtain what, without it, they could never have, an ultimate fact unitizing the elements of our knowledge natural and revealed into one consistent whole.

Let it be observed and kept in mind, that in all we have said, we have had no desire to explain either the Divine or the human natures; that would be equally fruitless and impious; but we do aim to show that the union of these in the being we call Christ involves no problem more difficult of conception or belief than those which lie at the foundations of either philosophy or theology. The one correlates the subject and object in a way incomprehensible by our finite faculties; the other the Creator and creation; and Christology does no more with the Divine and human natures in the person of Immanuel, God with us.

Upon close examination it will be found that the errors in philosophy and in theology correspond respectively to the false Christologies that have divided the Church for ages. Heresies in respect to Christ have the same root as errors in philosophizing; indeed, they are the same vicious methods of thought adopted in respect to different subjects; they differ not in form, but in matter. We now propose, with the reader's patience, to show this briefly, and thus close the discussion.

There are four factors to be considered in the solution of the philosophical problem relating to subject and object; there are but four in the solution of the Christological in relation to divinity and humanity in the person of Christ. Dr. Shedd, in his *History of Christian Doctrine*, one of the last and best authorities on the subject,

states these last with great clearness ; but he fails to notice their connection with the former. It was not, perhaps, in his plan to do this, and yet it is hardly possible to comprehend the one without the other.

1. The first great system that demands our attention is Realism, a system that has had many and able advocates. It is as old as philosophy itself. Ever since men have formulated their ideas upon the operations of their own minds in this process called thought, Realism has had its troops of defenders. In ancient, as well as in modern times, there have been many schools of Realists, but they have differed only in the application of principles and matters of detail. The ground principle has been held, enunciated, and defended in common. Its fundamental hypothesis is, that all our knowledge is derived from impressions made upon the organs of sense, and reflection upon these. Sensation is every thing ; the object, or what is without the mind, is magnified in importance, and the subject, or the mind itself, as far as concerns the acquisition of ideas, or knowledge, is forced into the background ; it is merely the plate prepared for the impression, and, through the senses, the objective world photographs itself upon it. The mind's knowledge is determined by the impressions made. In modern times, this school has been greatly divided in opinion, and many modifications of its fundamental doctrine have been proposed, even as far as to reach the representative Idealism of Locke and Leibnitz.

In respect to Christology, we have a sect that corresponds with this philosophical school precisely ; as the Realist subordinates, to too great an extent, the object to the subject, the mind to the world, so these exalt the human nature in Christ above the Divine ; in some cases even to the exclusion of the Divine altogether, as in pure Arianism. This sect is best known to the student of ecclesiastical history as the Ebionite. At one time it was large and influential. This doctrine has many phases, in writers both ancient and modern ; and these, having many names, perplex even diligent readers ; but they may be generalized into one class, whose essential feature is that they all deny the Divinity of Christ. They contend he was a creature, and not the Creator ; some that he was created before all others and all things, but still he is a *κτίσμα*. The semi-Arians allowed that the Son, or Logos, was of a nature similar to that of God, but not

identical with it; they could not, therefore, attribute divinity to Christ. They recognized in him the *Anthropos*, but not the *Theos*, and consequently could not sincerely say he was the *Theanthropos*. Arian, semi-Arian, Socinian, and Unitarian are all alike in this, that they can not attribute divinity, in its proper sense, to our adorable Redeemer. They admit he was inspired, but an inspired *man*. So were Isaiah, Jeremiah, and all the prophets and apostles, and according to many of our modern Unitarians, so were Shakspeare, Milton, and Byron. The Son of God, say they, is not a subsistence in the essence, but only an effluence from it. From this it follows that, in their view, there can not be in him a union of two natures. The human is all, the divine is nothing. It is easy to be seen that those who were Realists in philosophy, had they turned their attention to the solution of the Christological problem, would have become Ebionites; and, *vice versâ*, those theologians who deny the divinity of Christ are Realists of one school or another, Materialists in some form or other. Locke was a Unitarian, and Priestley a Socinian.

2. The second philosophical school we notice is the Idealist, just the opposite of the former, subjecting, as it does, all things to the mind itself, and even denying, in some of this school, all objective entity whatever. Berkeley and Hume are well-known examples. These show the reactionary tendency of the human mind in such cases. It was Locke's theory of ideas that drove Berkeley to the position that there is nothing real but mind, and this Hume carried to its last result in pure Idealism; nothing exists but the ideas, feelings, and impressions of our own minds. With these men, as well as with the ancient Idealists, the subject was exalted and the object depressed. The reality of the outward was ignored, the conceptions of the mind, if it be not nonsense to so call them, were all the reality that could in the nature of the case be. It is not difficult to reduce the boasted argument of Hume against miracles to a *reductio ad absurdum*, allowing him to be right in his philosophy; for if things exist only in idea, as he maintained, confessedly miracles do so exist, and consequently they have all the reality that any thing can have, even the sophist himself. Miracles, then, on his principles, have all the reality that any thing can have. This may serve to show how self-destructive these partial philosophical systems are. Who ever denies the existence of the subject that thinks, or the object that is thought about, or

who does not give to both the relation they hold in the constitution of nature as given by the Deity, never can have a consistent philosophy. God himself has correlated subject and object, and established the laws of each; therefore, he who thinks as God made him to think, and thinks so as to attain the truth, which is the correspondence of the object in idea to what it is in reality, must recognize the primary importance of both subject and object, and that these are correlates in the laws of thinking.

Gnosticism made the same mistake in respect to Christology that Idealism did in philosophy. It denied the human nature in Christ. He was, said the Gnostic, an *æon*—an emanation from the divine *pleroma*, or fullness. Christ the man was only a phantasm, and therefore there was no Jesus till the immersion in the Jordan, and then only in appearance. He had no objective existence as a man. As the Ebionite admitted the humanity but denied the divinity, the Gnostic admitted the divinity but denied the humanity; each was right and each was wrong, because each was partial. Each was right in his admission and wrong in his denial. Here, as well as in the analogous system of philosophy, there were many shades of opinion, but, as in the one, all meet in a denial of the objectivity and very existence of matter, so all Gnostic sects, from Patripassian to Apollinarian, agreed in a denial of Christ's proper humanity. How sure are men's philosophies to warp their judgments when they forsake the simple declarations of Holy Writ for the vagaries of speculation! The Gnostics questioned the authenticity of all those passages in the New Testament which teach the real existence of the man Jesus, or they gave such an interpretation to them as made them nugatory. With the Gnostic, what could be the meaning of Paul's fine declaration which supplements the theology of the Jew with the assertion of Christ's manhood, thus giving us a saving Christology? "There is one God," says he, "and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all." The Jew believed the first of these declarations; the Christian, both; the Gnostic, in reality, neither.

Though many Gnostics conceded the threefold distinction of body, soul, and spirit, even as Paul does in the well-known passage of his in First Thessalonians, "I pray God your whole spirit, and soul, and body, be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus

Christ," yet they could not confess that the divine Logos was united to a rational human soul. They lost sight of the human factor in working out this great problem of our redemption through Christ, just as the Unitarianism of the present day loses sight of the Divine.

3. The third general error in philosophy is Absolutism, better known, in its bearing on religious questions, as Pantheism, now fearfully prevalent in Germany and France, and making its way into England and the United States. The central error in this system is that it confounds the distinction between subject and object; it identifies them; the subject is the object, and the object is the subject. The mind is but a function of matter in a certain form. Separate and apart from the brain there is no spirit, no mind. The distinction between matter and mind, say they, is a false distinction, one without a difference, for they are identical. To speak of a distinct entity, called spirit, and most of all, to predicate existence of it either before or after death, is nonsense. Around this pivotal point revolve all the metaphysical wheels and bands of Materialism. Its gospel is, All being is one, and that is matter. It seeks to free itself from the faults of both the preceding systems, and unites subject and object in an ultimate principle, one in essence, differing only in form. This is true of Pantheism, whether we view it in its grosser or more refined forms. The former makes the world God, and God the world; the latter allows an *animus mundi*, and makes that God. It is all the same; God and the world are identified; the nature of mind and the nature of matter is one nature. God and the world are one.

In Christology we have the parallel system in Eutychianism. It asserts the unity of self-consciousness in Christ, but loses sight of the duality of his nature. Eutyches taught, that in the incarnation the human nature was transmuted into the divine, so that the resultant was one person and one nature. He would say God suffered on the cross. As Pantheism in philosophy identified the world with God, thus Eutychianism identified the man Jesus and the infinite God. Its difficulty as a dogmatic system is with all those passages in the Gospels and Epistles that postulate the essential difference between the two natures in the person of Christ, and the subordination of the human to the divine. "My Father is greater than I;" and yet in the Pauline Christology Christ "thought it not robbery to be equal with God." Our faith is, he thought right. No system of

faith in Christ can be right that overlooks the fact that he was tempted in all points as we are, but without sin ; that he was bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh ; that he had a human soul ; and that God assumed our nature, sinless as it was in Adam at his creation, but that he did not change it into the divine. He took it into heaven glorified, but it is our nature still. He is clothed with it now, and it is the type of what we shall be when we, too, are glorified in him. Eutychianism is at fault, then, as a system of Christology, because it identifies the divine and human natures.

4. Finally, we have a fourth system of philosophy deserving our notice in this discussion, because it corresponds with the only remaining generic error in regard to Christ. This is Dualism, differing from the three others in this, that, while it avoids their respective errors, it unduly elevates both subject and object. These are held asunder as being in irreconcilable opposition. Each is referred to a principle of its own ; hence, it recognizes two absolute principles, and these in antagonism. It admits the object, and that it has real existence ; in like manner it admits the subject. Nor does it identify these as do Absolutism and all forms of Materialism, but it opposes the one to the other. There is not one ultimate principle in philosophy, namely, God, without whom, in his unity, no system of the laws of thinking can be self-authenticating ; but there are two principles in nature, and these are absolute. There are really two Gods. Like the preceding systems, this divides itself into many forms. It had many disciples in the Orient in ancient times, and it largely influenced the early Church in the days of the Apostles.

Nestorianism is a form of religious thought exactly accordant with this philosophy. It may well be doubted whether or not Nestorius, from whom this heresy derives its name, and who was its great champion, really contended for two Christs, one human, the other divine ; but the system itself, as taught by his followers afterward, admitted two natures, but denied their union in one person. With the Nestorian there are two selves held in juxtaposition, so to speak ; the acts of each deriving no character from the other. There is no divine humiliation in the incarnation, for the seat of that is in the humanity, and this is not united in a self-conscious Theanthropos ; neither is there any exaltation of humanity, for that is in the distinct divinity. Each nature is in marked insulation, and thus Nestorianism

denies the condescension and the exaltation of the one Christ, the humbled and glorified Messiah. The logical conclusion forced upon the Nestorian was, that at the Ascension the humanity was laid aside. The Word made flesh did not take our glorified humanity into heaven.

As each of these four generic forms of error in philosophy denies a fact of consciousness, so each of these four false views of Christ denies a truth of Revelation. There are four, and only four, conditions to a true solution of the initial problem in each sphere. These are, in respect to the philosophical problem :

1. The subject is.
2. The object is.
3. They are essentially different.
4. They are necessarily united in thought.

Of the Christological problem they are :

1. The divine is.
2. The human is.
3. They are essentially different.
4. They are united, not blended, in one person. That person is Christ.

Now, dear reader, what think you of the Christ? Can you, in good faith, say, without equivocation, without reservation—He is “God manifested in flesh, justified in spirit, seen by angels, preached to the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up in glory.” If this be not a dear verse to you, be sure you have not yet a Scriptural Christology. The teachings of Scripture relating to this “mystery of godliness” can be harmonized only on the admission of our Savior’s essential divinity and humanity. Had we time and space, it would be pleasant to collate the passages in the Old Testament and the New that set our adorable Savior before us in this light ; but what need, when we have the radical conception that is found in them all? “The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.” Let our readers keep steadily in their minds the four elements in the Christological problem as we have endeavored to develop them, and while his wonder at the infinite condescension of our Immanuel will not be lessened, but rather increased, and while he will confess himself wholly incompetent to solve the “mystery of mysteries” on principles of human reason, independently of the light that revelation sheds upon

it, his faith will be better prepared to lay hold on Christ without reluctance. He will see that the errors which have been made in the great systems of contradictory and inconsistent philosophy repeat themselves, in man's darkened understanding, when he deserts the utterances of the Holy Spirit concerning the nature of Christ for the fallible speculations of uninspired men.

The press is now teeming with books discussing the question of Christ's life. We are not alarmed at this ; on the contrary, we rather rejoice at the mental activity his strange character awakens in this thinking age. These "Lives of Jesus," no matter by whom written, only confirm us in the conviction that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, have given us the only rational and consistent life of Jesus ; that, till his divinity, his humanity, his miracles, his sacrificial death, and his glorious resurrection, be accepted as they are recorded by these plain men, and as they were universally received by all the disciples in the beginning, he will be an enigma and a paradox, a stumbling-stone and a rock of offense ; certain we are that no hypothesis can be framed, that will satisfy the demands of the reason, to account for the facts connected with the mysterious person of Jesus of Nazareth. We read these books, and acknowledge what merit they possess, but we see in them a value their authors and their admirers would be slow to concede. They all show how futile must be every attempt to account for the phenomena of Christ's life while a controlling and unitizing principle is wanting.

We conclude with the earnest hope that our brethren will not lose sight of the grandeur of the plea which their fathers in the Gospel made for the superlative glory of the Messiahship—that stumbling-block to the Jew, that foolishness to the Greek, but to those who are called both Jews and Greeks, Christ, the power of God, and the wisdom of God. We make this prominent as the foundation of the Church, the bond of our union, and the symbol of our confession. We rest in Him "who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption."

VI.—THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

THE purpose of this article is to answer the following questions:

- I. WHAT IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD?
- II. WAS THE KINGDOM OF GOD FULLY ESTABLISHED BEFORE THE ASCENSION OF CHRIST TO HEAVEN?
- III. HAS THE KINGDOM OF GOD YET COME, OR BEEN ESTABLISHED?

Without preliminary or ceremony, let attention be directed to these questions:

I. *What is the kingdom of God?*

That the same is meant by "kingdom of God," "kingdom of Heaven," "His kingdom," and the "kingdom of His dear Son," as a general rule, there can be but little doubt, whether the same is meant in every instance or not. That which is called "His kingdom," (Matt. xvi, 28,) is called "the kingdom of God," (Mark ix, 1, and Luke ix, 27.) The same kingdom mentioned in the phrase, "The Son of Man coming in *his kingdom*," is also mentioned in the phrase, "The *kingdom* of God," for these are two reports of the same speech. The two expressions are simply two designations of the same kingdom. The same, precisely, that is called "The kingdom of Heaven," (Matt. xix, 23,) is called "The kingdom of God," (Mark x, 25.) In Matthew the record is, "That a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of Heaven," and in Mark it is, "A rich man to enter into the kingdom of *God*." The "kingdom of Heaven" at hand, as recorded (Matt. iii, 2,) is undoubtedly the same as the "kingdom of God," (Mark i, 14,) for these are two records of the same thing. The same kingdom is meant (Matt. xiii, 11) in the words, "Because to you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of *Heaven*," that is meant, (Mark iv, 11,) "To you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of *God*." "He that is least in the kingdom of *Heaven* is greater than he," (Matt. xi, 11,) and "He that is least in the kingdom of *God* is greater than he," (Luke

vii, 28,) are simply two records of the same thing, and the same kingdom is meant in both records.

In the following language the phrases "My Church" and "the kingdom of Heaven" are two designations for the same. That which is called "My Church" is called "the kingdom of Heaven." "I say also to you, that you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hades shall not prevail against it; and I will give to you the keys of the kingdom of Heaven; and whatever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatever you shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." (See Matt. xvi, 18, 19.) When we think and speak of what the Lord calls "My Church," we should keep in mind that he calls the same thing, in the same connection, "The kingdom of Heaven," and that he calls the same "My kingdom." (John xviii, 36.) Paul's "general assembly and Church of the First-born," to which he said "We are come," (Heb. xii, 23,) is the same as his "kingdom that can not be moved," verse 28 of the same chapter. It is the same as his "one body," (Eph. iv, 4, and 1 Cor. xii, 13.) All who enter the "one body" at all are immersed into it, or all who enter the kingdom at all, which is the same as entering the "one body," enter it by being born of water and of the Spirit. "Except a man be born again, he can not see (or enjoy) the kingdom of God." (See John iii, 3.) "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter into the kingdom of God." (See John iii, 5.) The same community is styled "the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and support of the truth." (1 Tim. iii, 13.) "In Christ," is in the body, Church, or kingdom. To know what the Church is, the body of Christ, the house of God, the temple of God, the building of God, is to know what the kingdom of God is. This view will assist much in ascertaining what the kingdom of God is, and several other things to be investigated in this article.

When we are thinking of the Lord's community as a *body*, we think of the head and the individual members, the life and support of the body. When we think of the same community as a *house*, or family, we immediately think of the head of the family, the members, the discipline and ruling of a family, the care and oversight of a family, the support and dependence of a family, the accession by birth or adoption, whichever figure may be used, and the losses by

death, or those who have abandoned the family. When we think of the same community as a *temple*, or building, we think of the proprietor, foundation, the lively stones built together in it, and the builders. When we think of it as a kingdom, we think of a king, constitution, laws, territory, subjects. When we think of it literally, as the Church, congregation, or community, founded by Christ, the only divinely-founded religious community on earth, we think of God, who authorized it, of the prophets who predicted its founding, with many of its stupendous and momentous surroundings—the Lord Messiah, who founded it, the great truth on which it is built, the authorized apostles and evangelists who first preached the Gospel, called people together, under their new head, in the new community, or the Church, making “one new man.” It has Christ for its head, the Gospel—the power of God—to turn the world to God—the teaching of Christ and his apostles for its edification and instruction. Christ is its supreme authority for every thing. His authority is set forth in his own teaching and that of his divinely-authorized and inspired apostles.

The Church, or community of the living God, is composed of members, and has a head, Gospel, teaching, and territory. Bishops, or overseers, and deacons, in their work, are limited to the congregation in their own vicinity, having no jurisdiction in other congregations. The Church of the living God, the body of Christ, or kingdom of God, embraces all the local congregations, with the members, in all the world—all who are truly the people of God. As a whole, it is not an organized body, and has no method of acting in conventional form, in making decrees, laws, or decisions. Its head has made, signed, sealed, and delivered to it *his* laws and decrees, and demands of the Church, or kingdom, implicit obedience. It is not the business of the Church to *make* laws or decrees, but implicitly to *obey* and submit to the laws and decrees made by the Head of the Church.

This community, Church, or kingdom, of which Christ is the head, or king, and all that pertains to it, was embraced in “the eternal purpose of God,” but had no existence, in the form of a community, Church, or kingdom, only in the purpose of God for ages. The same that was embodied in the eternal purpose—“a secret,” “hid in God”—was subsequently embodied in the promise to Abra-

ham. It was still a secret, a mystery, in a promise of a blessing for all the families of the earth, without any revelation explaining what that blessing was. That promise embraced the Messiah, the Gospel, the Church, and all the attendant blessings for the human race. Still the Church, or kingdom, did not exist in fact, and the blessings were spoken of as "good things *to come*," and not good things *already come*. The same precisely, embodied first in the purpose, and then in the promise of God, subsequently filled a large space in prophecy, but still as "good things to come." Peter has the following comment touching the prophets: "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come to you; searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. To whom it was revealed, that not to themselves, but to us they did minister the things, which are now reported to you by them who have preached the Gospel to you with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven; into which things the angels desire to look." (See 1 Pet. i, 10, 11, 12.) The kingdom of God is found, first, in the eternal purpose of God, then in the promise of God to Abraham, then in the prophecy, and then in the preaching of John the Immerser. In the preaching of John it is in different form, and a new item comes into the preaching. It is now, "the kingdom of God *at hand*," "the kingdom of God *approaches*," etc. This opens the way for the inquiry—

II. *Was the kingdom of God fully established before the ascension of Christ to heaven?*

This question deserves a very full and satisfactory answer. That the kingdom, or Church, was not fully established, in operation, and doing its work, in the life-time of the Savior, is evident from the following Scriptures and considerations:

1. If the Church, or kingdom, had been established fully, in operation, doing its work, and the apostles not only members of the Church, or citizens of the kingdom, but active agents in it, the apostles and all his disciples, at that time, could not have been so greatly mistaken as they were, and as they remained till they had interviews with the Lord after his resurrection, in reference to the nature of his kingdom. In an interview with the Lord, after he rose from the dead, the disciples said: "Lord, wilt thou at this time

restore again the kingdom to Israel?" (See Acts i, 6.) From this request, it is evident that they were not conscious of his having established a kingdom; that they did not yet understand that his kingdom was to be one "not of this world," but expected a kingdom for Israel, like the one in the time of David or Solomon, and that they were still looking for the kingdom to come. When he died they desponded, supposed his purpose was defeated, and said, "We trusted that it was he who should have redeemed Israel." (See Luke xxiv, 21.) But when he rose, their hope revived that he would redeem Israel from their oppression from the Romans, restore to them their national honors, and be their king; and, in view of this, made the request that he would restore the kingdom to Israel. This shows that they knew nothing about his having already established any kingdom. They certainly, as his ministers, would have known it, had the kingdom been fully established. It was not then established.

2. After the Lord had entered his ministry fully, and was completely before the people, instead of his regarding his kingdom or Church as established, he said, as quoted before to a different point: "On this rock I will build my Church." Did he say, "I *will* build my Church," when he *had* built his Church? In the next verse, (xvi, 19,) he says, "I will give to you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatever you shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." At this advanced period in the Lord's ministry he was looking into the future for the building of his Church, and the giving of the keys of the kingdom of Heaven, or the power to open the Church, to Peter. The Church was not built, and the kingdom not opened, when the Lord uttered this language.

3. The first commission was limited to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel." Under this commission the preachers were expressly forbidden to go in the way of the Gentiles. John the Immerser came "preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying, Repent ye; for the kingdom of Heaven is at hand." (See Matt. iii, 1.) "At hand," did not mean that it *had* come, or that it was *far off*. In the first commission, as recorded Matt. x, 5, 6, 7, the Lord commanded the apostles to "go not in the way of the Gentiles, nor into any city of the Samaritans; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And as you go, preach, saying, The kingdom of

Heaven is at hand." This was the main theme under the first commission: to call the people to repentance, to immerse them, and prepare them for the near approaching kingdom, or reign of Heaven.

4. In view of the approaching kingdom, or reign of Heaven, the Lord taught his disciples to pray "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." (See Matt. vi, 10.) This corresponds with the preaching. The disciples were commanded to preach that the kingdom was at hand, and to pray for it to come, and that the will of God should be done *on earth* as it is in heaven." He certainly did not teach them to pray "Thy kingdom *come*," after the kingdom *had come*.

5. The Lord said: "Verily I say to you, that there be some of them that stand here, who shall not taste of death till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." Did the Lord say this when he knew that they had seen the kingdom, and were ministers in it? Surely there can be no good reason for thinking so. They had been preaching that the kingdom was at hand, and praying for it to come, and believed that it would come. They had forsaken their business and followed the Lord. They had preached and prayed, as he told them to do, but did not understand the nature of the main matter involved in their preaching and prayers. They were pressing the Lord for explanations in reference to things which it was not proper to open up yet. They expected pecuniary support, and probably office, or some kind of worldly honors and promotions in the government, which they still kept in view, and frequently became restless and impatient. Such expressions as the one just quoted were intended and calculated to satisfy the disciples and pacify them, without a full explanation of what he did not intend to explain at that time, or that any body should fully understand. It was true that the kingdom had not *then* come, but that some who stood there should not die till they *saw it come*.

6. The explanation that the Lord made before Pilate, "My kingdom is not of this world," as recorded John xviii, 36, shows that the kingdom was not yet fully established. Pilate inquired, "Are you the king of the Jews?" This question looked to the charge "He is the king of the Jews," which was intended to fasten treasonable purposes on him. Had he been then an established king of the Jews, or of his disciples, with a kingdom fully established and in operation as a

distinct body, in any form, there would certainly have been no difficulty in identifying either the king or the kingdom. He, however, did not deny that he had a kingdom in view, but explained that it was not of this world—that he was no rival of Cæsar; that this kingdom was no rival of the Roman Government, or any other civil government, as it was not of this world, but a heavenly, a spiritual, or a religious institution, entirely distinct from the governments of the world.

7. Beyond all doubt, the kingdom of God, or Church, was not fully established while the apostles, who were the active and effective agents in preaching the Gospel, making disciples, founding churches, setting them in order; advocating, maintaining, and defending the faith, were erring, blundering, and misunderstanding in reference to some of the clearest, most vital, and fundamental matters of the kingdom, or Church; while they did not believe the Lord's own clear statement touching his betrayal into the hands of enemies, his crucifixion, death, and resurrection; while they were doubting and wavering; while they all had their hearts set on an earthly king and kingdom, a mere worldly government; while one of his apostles was a traitor, engaged in a treasonable conspiracy which resulted in the betrayal of his Master, and another, fearing to be identified with his Lord, denied him three times, and uttered bitter oaths; while the account of his resurrection, when reported to the apostles, "seemed to them as idle tales;" while they were all inquiring, "Wilt thou, at this time, restore the kingdom to Israel?" while the Lord, instead of acting in the capacity of the King, High-Priest, filled the place of the suffering, bleeding, and dying victim! Certainly the kingdom was not fully established before the Lord rose from the dead; before he gave the apostles the Great Commission, to "go into all the world"—to "preach the Gospel to every creature;" before he ascended to heaven, "led captivity captive, and gave gifts to men"—"sent the Holy Spirit to guide the apostles into all truth;" before the great High-Priest of the Christian profession had gone into the true holy place, of which the holy places on earth were only typical—into heaven itself, with his own blood, to appear in the presence of God for us—to make his one sin-offering in the end of the ages—the only sin-offering that can purge us forever from our sins. To say that the kingdom was fully established at any period while the matters here mentioned were transpiring, is certainly the culmination of all absurdity.

It may be urged, in opposition to this, that the Lord said to some in his time, "The kingdom of God is in you." He certainly did not mean that the kingdom of God was *in the hearts* of those wicked and caviling Jews to whom he spoke. While it is true that the Greek preposition *ἐν*, translated "in," literally means *in*, it is equally true that there are places where it should not be rendered *in*. This may be learned from the scope and connection generally. The case in hand is one of that kind. "The kingdom of God is *among* you," instead of *in you*; or *in your midst*, is the true idea. In what sense was the kingdom of God *among* them? In its elements, its incipient or preliminary state; in John the Immerser, the people prepared for the Lord by him; by the apostles, and the seventy whom the Lord sent out under the first commission. It was in the Lord himself, in those whom he sent, and the disciples they were making gradually coming forth, steadily developing itself, being more and more fully unfolded, till its full and complete establishment, in a visible form, on Pentecost.

Here we arrive at a grand culmination, a glorious period, and a full development of what had been preparing, unfolding, and developing regularly but gradually for several years. Here we find the grand change in the apostles. Their erring, blundering, wavering, and misunderstanding ceased. Their timidity, fear to be identified with Jesus, and want of independence ceased. Their ideas of a kingdom of this world at once vanished. Their unbelief terminated. Every man of them becomes bold, independent, and firm as the everlasting hills. No priests, no rabbis; no lawyers, doctors, or philosophers; no jurists, statesmen, or rulers of any sort, now intimidate them. They openly proclaim the Gospel in the face of the world. What they say at the start they say all the time. Not a man of them ever relinquished his ground, departed from or repudiated a truth uttered by any one of them, from this time on. All that was done before this grand change in the apostles was preparatory and preliminary. What was done after this change, was in carrying out their great commission in the new administration. After this period, they were acting under their new commission as the ambassadors of the new King; making known the new law using the keys in opening the new kingdom, or Church; bringing light out of darkness, and order out of confusion. A more clearly marked line never was described between

any old and new orders of things, than the one between the state of things before the Holy Spirit came to guide the apostles into all truth, and the state of things after that event. Still, some are doubting whether the kingdom of God has yet come, or is yet established. Others are claiming that their doubts have all been removed—that they are convinced that the kingdom has not come—and are laboring with great zeal to prove this. This opens the way for the third question to be considered in this article:

III. *Has the kingdom of God yet come, or been established?*

To this question the following arguments shall be addressed. The question is not whether "the everlasting kingdom" has come, of which we read, (2 Pet. i, 11;) nor whether the kingdom, "delivered up to God, even the Father," as described by Paul, (1 Cor. xv, 24,) or the kingdom in the glorified state, has come. The question to be considered relates not to the period when all the enemies of the Lord shall have been put under his feet—when the Lord "shall show who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords." That the kingdom, in that state, and the time when the King will show this, has not come, all persons of good Bible intelligence will admit. But has the kingdom, in the sense in which John the Immerser speaks of it, when he says, "The kingdom of Heaven is at hand," or the kingdom of which John thus speaks, for the coming of which the Lord taught the disciples to pray, "Thy kingdom come;" the kingdom to which the Lord referred when he said to Peter, "I will give you the keys of the kingdom of Heaven;" has this kingdom come? Is the kingdom in existence of which the Lord spoke, when he said, "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God"—"Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God?" Is there any kingdom of Heaven, or of Christ, in existence at this time? Is the Lord Jesus the Christ, King? Has Jesus any reign on earth? Has Messiah any kingdom on earth? It is affirmed in this article that the Messiah is King—that he has a kingdom. The following arguments are offered in proof of this:

1. The first argument offered in support of the position just taken is, that there is no way to account for the change from the first commission to the second, or for the difference between these commissions, only by admitting that the kingdom "at hand," as

preached in the first commission, had come when the apostles commenced preaching under the second. John the Immerser, the Lord, the twelve apostles, and the seventy whom the Lord sent out under the first commission, all preached that the kingdom of Heaven was at hand. Under the last commission they were not commanded to preach, saying, "The kingdom of Heaven is at hand." The reason is that the "kingdom at hand," while they were under the first commission, had come when they commenced under the second. They were not simply not commanded to preach, under the second commission, saying, "The kingdom of Heaven is at hand," but they never did thus preach. But if the kingdom has not come, was the preaching, saying, "The kingdom of Heaven is at hand," true? It was not true that it was *at hand then*, if it has not come yet.

2. The Lord, while the apostles were under the first commission, taught the disciples to pray, "Thy kingdom come." This was the grand theme during that period of preaching and prayer. The Lord did not teach them to pray for the kingdom to come after the kingdom had come. There is no account of any holy teacher ever teaching the disciples to pray for the kingdom to come after the Lord ascended to heaven; nor is there an intimation of any one ever praying for the kingdom to come after that event. The reason is, that the kingdom had come.

3. It is perfectly clear, from several Scriptures, that the apostles understood the things proclaimed by John to be at hand all fulfilled when the Church was established on Pentecost. Paul explains to the disciples of John, in Ephesus, that "John truly immersed with the immersion of repentance, saying to the people that they should believe on Him that should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus." (See Acts xix, 4.) Here is clearly the general idea that what John preached as "at hand" had actually come; was fulfilled at the time when Paul made this comment. The same is clear from Paul's remarks as recorded Acts xiii, 23, 24. He says, "Of this man's seed has God, according to his promise, raised up to Israel a Savior Jesus; when John had first preached, before His coming, the immersion of repentance to all Israel. And as John fulfilled his course he said, Who think you that I am? I am not he. But, behold, there comes one after me whose shoes of his feet I am not worthy to loose." These Scriptures, with other references to John and his immersion, show that

the things by him proclaimed to be at hand, to come, and drawing nigh, were fulfilled, had actually come, when the apostles referred back to them. The central idea in the preaching of John was that the kingdom of God was *at hand*.

4. When the Lord was on trial in the Roman court, Pilate put the question to him, "Are you a king?" Though he was then only prospectively a king, he did not deny being a king, nor of having a kingdom, though it was then in an incipient state, but explained, "My kingdom is not of this world." (See John xviii, 36.) Paul was accused of "saying that there is another king, one Jesus." (See Acts xvii, 7.) There is no intimation, in the whole record, of Paul's correcting this charge, or denying it. If he had not preached that Jesus was a king, he certainly would have denied the charge, or would have explained what he did preach, or Luke would have written out an explanation of their unfounded charge. But the truth is, that he had a kingdom, when he was before Pilate, in its elements, like leaven at work in the meal, like the mustard-seed planted, but not matured—not formed and perfected, but the kingdom *coming*. At the time Paul was charged with preaching that Jesus was a king, the kingdom had come, and the disciples were in the kingdom.

5. The Lord said to Nicodemus: "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God." Does not that imply, that when a man is born again, he shall see or enjoy the kingdom of God? "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." A man, then, enters the kingdom of God by a birth of water and of the Spirit. When does he enter the kingdom? At the time when he is born of water and of the Spirit, or at some subsequent period? Certainly at the time when he is born of water and of the Spirit. The time when he is born of water and of the Spirit is, literally, the time when he is converted. The time when a man is converted is the time, then, when he enters the kingdom. The kingdom had then come, in the time of the apostles, and the thousands turned to the Lord under their preaching, entered the kingdom of God.

6. Before the kingdom was fully established, and before the door was opened, the Lord said to Peter: "I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatever you shall loose on earth shall be

loosed in heaven." (See Matt. xvi, 19.) This work also related to the remission of sins, as may be seen by John xx, 23: "Whosoever sins you remit, they are remitted to them, and whosoever sins you retain, they are retained." This using the keys was to be performed in their divine mission on earth, and in connection with the remission of sins. Certainly Peter did not use the keys of the kingdom of God, in opening the kingdom, when there was no kingdom, or when the kingdom had not come. To use these keys of the kingdom, or to "remit sins," was to open the way to the remission of sins, or to open the kingdom and admit subjects into the new reign. Jesus, as the king, gave to Peter the keys of the kingdom, to use, in his divine mission on earth. This he could not have done if there had been no kingdom on earth in his time. Peter did bind and loose *on earth*, and what he bound and loosed on earth was ratified in heaven. That binding and loosing on earth was in opening the kingdom of God—declaring the terms of remission of sins, *in the time of Peter, on earth*. There was, then, a kingdom on earth, in the time of Peter, to open, and it was a part of his work, in his mission, to open it.

7. Alluding to the same kingdom, in the same conversation, as recorded further on in the same chapter, (Matt. xvi, 28,) after saying to Peter, "I will give to you the keys of the kingdom," the Lord said, "There be some standing here who shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom;" or, as reported Mark ix, 1, "till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." Some have supposed that this had its fulfillment in the mountain of transfiguration. But it can not, with any good reason, be said that the kingdom came there in any sense, or that it was even represented in vision. The King was there shown, and his divine majesty seen as it is now seen in heaven; and three witnesses, Peter, James, and John, were enabled to say, as Peter did, (2 Pet. i, 16, 17, 18,) "For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honor and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the Excellent Glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice, which came from heaven, we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount." The King was shown here, in divine majesty, as he would appear in

the near approaching reign, to his eye-witnesses, that they might be able to testify, as Peter did. The promise, in the words, "There be some standing here who shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom," or "till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power," was not that they should see Jesus, *in divine majesty*, or *the glorified Jesus*, but "see him coming in his kingdom," or "see the kingdom of God come with power." This they did not see in the mountain of transfiguration, but did see before they tasted death. The event described in the second chapter of Acts met and fulfilled not only what the Lord meant when he said, "see the kingdom of God come with power," but what was spoken of by Joel and other prophets. A complete change in the apostles followed the grand and sublime transaction on Pentecost, from wavering to stability, from unbelief to the full assurance of faith, from timidity to boldness, from doubts to certainty; from the first to the second commission, from errors, blunders, and mistakes, to infallible guidance of the Spirit of all truth and all revelation; from the long series of preparatory and preliminary work to the grand culmination, in the kingdom, actually *come in power*, the using of the keys, in opening the kingdom, and the entrance of three thousand souls into the new kingdom.

8. "The seed of the kingdom is the Word of God," and certainly "the seed of the kingdom," "the word of the kingdom," belongs to the period of the existence of the kingdom, and not some period when the kingdom has no existence. The sowing of the seed of the kingdom is preaching the Gospel. The parables of the sower, the leaven in the meal, and several other parables show that the fortunes of the kingdom are in this world; that the tares and the wheat were to grow together, if not in the kingdom, in the same territory, and at the *same time*, and that, at the end of the world, the Lord would send his angels and gather out all things offensive. (Matt. xiii, 26-29.)

9. Paul, speaking of the kingdom of God, as existing in his times, tells what it *is not* and what *it is*. "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit." (See Rom. xiv, 17.) The apostle proceeds, in the next verse: "For he that in these things serves Christ is acceptable to God." The kingdom of God, of which Paul wrote, was in existence at the time of his writing, and men served Christ in it.

10. The Lord commissioned Paul to preach in the following words: "I have appeared to you for this purpose, to make you a minister and a witness, both of these things which you have seen, and of those things in the which I will appear to you; delivering you from the people and the Gentiles, to whom I now send you, to open their eyes, and turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins and an inheritance among those who are sanctified through faith in me." (See Acts xxvi, 16, 17, 18.) This work was to be done under Paul's mission, or during his natural life. Turning, then, from darkness to light was the same as delivering them from the power of darkness. This corresponds with the following language: "Giving thanks to the Father, who has made us fit to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light; who has delivered us from the power of darkness, and translates us into the kingdom of his dear Son." (See Col. i, 12, 13.) Those whom Paul here includes with himself were turned from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God—delivered from the power of darkness, and, with Paul, were translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son. They were in a kingdom that had then come, that then existed, and not one that had no existence.

11. John the apostle, in addressing the seven Churches in Asia, says: "I John, who also am your brother and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, was in the island called Patmos, for the Word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ." While in this world, John the apostle and those to whom he wrote were *in the kingdom* and patience of Jesus Christ. The kingdom had come, and they were in the kingdom. In this kingdom the Lord Jesus shall reign till he has put all his enemies under his feet, and then he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father, that God may be all in all.

12. Paul says: "You are come to Mount Zion, and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and Church of the first-born, who are enrolled in heaven;" and speaking of the same body further on, he says: "Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which can not be moved, let us have grace whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear." (See Heb. xii, 21-28.) They had come to this "Church of the first-born," "general assembly," or "kingdom,"

and were exhorted to serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear, when Paul wrote the letter to the Church in Rome. It has already been shown that the "Church" and "kingdom of God" are two designations for the same institution. To maintain, therefore, that there is no kingdom of God is the same as to maintain that there is no Church of God, no temple of God, no building or house of God, or no body of Christ. It is the same as to deny that there is any "house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and support of the truth," or that there was any, during the time the apostles were acting under the last commission, *actually existing*. Every reference, during the time the apostles were acting under the last commission, to the Church, the body of Christ, the building of God, the house of God, as then in existence, is a standing refutation of the theory that there is no kingdom of God in existence at this time.

There was, then, a kingdom of God in the time of the apostles. Peter used the keys of the kingdom, opened it; persons "born of water and of the Spirit" entered it; that kingdom is now in existence, and men and women enter into it, and are therefore properly said to be *in the kingdom* and patience of Jesus Christ.

VII.—CHURCH OFFICERS.*

III.—BISHOPS—THEIR DUTIES.

THE duties of the military bishops, or overseers, consisted in obeying the orders of their superior officers, especially of Moses, their commander-in-chief. (Num. xxxi.)

Jerobaal, who is also called Gideon, was a general, and Zebul is called his (ἐπίσκοπος) *bishop* or *overseer*. He was "the ruler of the city." He was the *overseer* and ruler. It was his duty to *oversee* and *rule*; that is, to inspect and govern.

These overseers being under the command of Jehoiada, it was

* See former article, Jan. No., page 117.

their duty to execute his orders, which they did. (2 Kings xi, 15; Sept., 4 Kings xi, 15.) The duties of such as were appointed overseers of the Lord's house, consisted in keeping it in repair and in good order. (V. 18.)

The 928 sons of Benjamin who settled in Jerusalem after the return from Babylon, had Joel, the son of Zichri, for their overseer. He was a civil ruler or overseer, and his duties were of a civil nature. In all cases where the oversight was military, the duties were also military; when the oversight was civil, the duties were also civil; when the oversight related to a house, the duties corresponded with the objects of the oversight.

The duties of ecclesiastical bishops, or overseers, correspond with the interests of the Churches over which such officers were appointed. They were required to (προσέχετε) give attention to themselves, and to all the flock in which (ἐν ᾧ) the Holy Spirit made them overseer, to tend the Church of the Lord, (κυρίου, not θεοῦ, Gb. Ln. Tf.), which he purchased with his own blood. They were also to guard them against "grievous wolves" who would not spare the flock, and men of their own selves who would speak perverse things to draw away disciples after them. Care, attention, and watchfulness were principal duties. The tending of the flock is embraced in the *care* of it. (Acts xx, 28.) Their qualifications, formerly noticed, are the exponents of their duties. No qualification is required for which a duty is contemplated.

IV.—BISHOPS—THEIR AUTHORITY.

Whatever may be the extent of a bishop's authority, it is restricted to the persons and places over which he is appointed an overseer. The bishop or overseer of Jerobaal was "the ruler of the city" of Sechem, and in this capacity he was overseer. He was, then, as bishop, a ruler, and this defines, to some extent, his authority. As bishop of that city, his jurisdiction was confined to its limits, the amount of his authority was measured by the laws of the city. He could make no laws of his own, as he was not a king, but the overseer of another man. He had, however, full authority, and it was his duty to execute all the laws of Sechem; and all the city were bound to obey him. The same is true of all overseers, as it respects their

authority and the obligations of those over whom they are invested with oversight.

We have already shown that overseers and elders in the Church of Christ are the same. They, therefore, have the same authority. Whatever appertains to the one also appertains to the other. The qualifications of a man for the oversight of a Church are to be determined by his family government. (1 Tim. iii, 4.) The good government of his family is shown by the subjection and gravity of his children. These evidences of good government should attend his oversight of a Church; and no member should be retained who refuses to be governed by faithful and competent overseers.

"Let the elders who rule well be counted worthy of double honor," is a divine precept, and it shows, at the same time, the authority of elders and the duty of members. When one rules well, and the others submit, all is right. But when the rule is bad, and there is no submission to the laws of God, all is wrong.

A bishop, or an elder, is an executive officer—not a legislator. Rebellion against him, when he is in the discharge of his official duties, is rebellion against Christ.

The bishops of Rome and her daughters have assumed so much authority, and such extensive jurisdiction, that the office is, by some, regarded as of no authority. In some instances, some Protestants, in their haste to leave Rome behind them, and in the distance, too, have passed Jerusalem without seeing it. Romanists and Episcopalians have made too much of the office—others, too little. In some countries, the office has grown into a bloated aristocracy—in others, it has died of a lean democracy.

DEACONS—WHAT ARE THEY?

The word (*διάκονος*), from which we get our word deacon, is translated, in the Common Version, *deacon*, three times, *servant*, seven times, and *minister*, twenty times. There is no necessity for this want of uniformity. The word deacon is, in fact, no translation of the word. It means, according to Webster, "a person in the lowest degree of holy orders;" in *Scotland*, "an overseer of the poor, and the master of an incorporated company." The original word is never so used in the New Testament. If we adopt a uniform translation,

minister is the preferable word. There are cases in which servant is admissible.

The idea that a *diakonos* (διάκονος) is a table servant, or a financial officer, is without any foundation. That a *diakonos* did sometimes perform service at table, and also attend to pecuniary matters, is true. But this is not peculiar to him, nor is it exclusively his business; and it is therefore not necessarily to be taken into a definition, or a translation of the word. In every case in which it is translated *deacon*, it should be rendered *minister*.

For the sake of English readers, we will consider all the passages in the New Testament in which the word occurs, and in the order in which they occur:

1. The mother of Zebedee's sons came to Jesus with her two sons, and requested that one of them might sit on his right hand, and the other on his left in his kingdom. This displeased the ten. But Jesus called them to him and said: "You know that the rulers of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them, and they who are great exercise authority over them. It shall not be so among you; but whoever would become great among you, let him be your (διάκονος) *minister*; and whoever would be first among you, let him be your (δοῦλος) *servant*; even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered to, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." (Matt. xx, 26, 27.

Both the words διάκονος and δοῦλος, which are frequently translated servant, are here used; and a clear distinction is made between them. The man who would become great among them was under the influence of a laudable desire; but he who would be first among them, desired *preëminence*, and therefore he was to be their servant. The Son of Man came not (δουλεύω) *to serve*, but (διακονῶ) *to minister*. The man who ministers is a minister; he who serves is a servant. Jesus, therefore, was a minister, but not a deacon.

Although the same word is used here which is translated deacon in three instances in the Common Version of the New Testament, yet all will see the impropriety of saying, If any man will become great among you, let him be your deacon.

2. "And the king coming in to view the guests, saw there a man not clothed with a wedding garment; and he says to him, Friend, how camest thou in hither, not having a wedding garment? And he

was speechless. Then the king said" (τοῖς διακόνοις) *to the ministers*, not (τοῖς δούλοις) *to the servants*, "Bind him hand and foot, and cast him forth into the outer darkness. There will be the weeping and the gnashing of the teeth." (Matt. xxii, 11, 12, 13, 14.) Every person would see the impropriety of translating the word (διάκονοι,) here, *deacons*—making the passage read: And the king said to the *deacons*, etc.

3. "And call not any your father on the earth; for one is your Father, he who is in heaven. Neither be called leaders; for one is your Leader, the Christ. But the greatest of you shall be your (διάκονος) *minister*"—not *deacon*. (Matt. xxiii, 11.)

4. "If any one desires to be first, he shall be last of all, and (διάκονος) *minister of all*." (Mark ix, 35.)

The case is not as strongly stated here as in Matthew, where (δοῦλος) *servant* is used. But the aspirant was not to become "*deacon*" of all.

5. The distinction is clearly drawn between (διάκονος) *minister* and (δοῦλος) *servant*, in Mark x, 43, 44: "But whoever would become great among you, shall be your minister; and whoever would become chiefest of you, shall be servant of all." Whoever would become great was not to be their *deacon*, but their *minister*.

6. "His mother says (τοῖς διακόνοις) *to the ministers*, Whatever he says to you, do." (John ii, 5.) The ruler of the feast did not know whence the best of the wine was; but his ministers who drew the water knew. These ministers were not *deacons*, as defined by Webster.

7. "If any one ministers to me, let him follow me; and where I am there shall my (διάκονος) *minister* be. And if any one ministers to me (ἐμοὶ διακονῇ) him will my father honor." (John xii, 26.) No scholar would think of rendering the passage, There shall my *deacon* be.

8. In Rom. xiii, 4, the civil ruler is called God's (διάκονος) *minister*; but not his *deacon*, table servant, nor financial officer. He was God's minister for good, to those who did good; but his "*avenger*" to those who did evil.

9. "For I say that Jesus Christ has been more a minister" (διάκονον γεγενῆσθαι,) not a *deacon*, "of the circumcision, for the sake of God's truth (ἐξ) in order to confirm the promises made to the fathers," etc.

10. "I commend to you Phœbe, our sister, who is a (*διδάσκουσαν*) minister of the Church which is in Cenchræa." If this woman was a "deaconsess" of the Church referred to, according to this passage, then Jesus Christ was a "deacon" of the circumcision, according to Rom. xv, 8. And if they were "deacons," then Paul and Apollos were not ministers, but "deacons," through whom the Corinthians believed (1 Cor. iii, 5); and God made the apostles able "deacons" (2 Cor. iii, 6); and they commended themselves as God's "deacons," in every thing (2 Cor. vi, 4). Yes, and Satan had his "deacons" also. And if Satan transforms himself into an angel of light, it is not wonderful if his (*διδάσκοντες*) "deacons" transform themselves into (*διδάσκοντες*) "deacons" of righteousness. (2 Cor. xi, 15.) If this rendering is correct, then Paul says: Are they "deacons" of Christ? (I speak as beside myself.) I am more (2 Cor. xi, 23). And in Gal. ii, 17, he says, "Is Christ, therefore, the deacon of sin?" And in Eph. iii, 7, he affirms that he was made a "deacon" of the Gospel; and in Eph. vi, 21, he says that Tychicus was a faithful deacon in the Lord.

11. "Paul and Timothy, servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus who are in Philippi, with the overseers and (*διακόνους*) ministers." (Phil. i, 1.) There is no more reason why the word should be translated "deacons" here than there is for translating it by the same word in all the places in which it is found in all the epistles. It is first assumed that there was an order of men in the Primitive Church called deacons, and then this assumption is made a reason for this rendering of the word. That there was a class of men called ministers is admitted. But there was no class answerable to an order of deacons. The same is true of 1 Tim. iii, 8, 12.

12. Paul calls himself a minister (Col. i, 22, 25), and Epaphras (i, 7), and, also, Tychicus (iv, 7); but no one thinks of calling them deacons. He also tells Timothy, "If thou put the brethren in mind of these things, thou shalt be a good (*διδάσκων*) minister of Christ Jesus." (1 Tim. iv, 6.) Why should the word be translated deacons in chap. iii, 8, 12, and minister in chap. iv, 6? If it should be shown that it may be translated "servant" in some places, this will not justify the translation in any other place, by "deacon." Stricter rules obtain in translation now than in former times.

LITERARY NOTICES.

HOME LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

- 1.—*The History of Christianity, from the birth of Christ to the abolition of Paganism in the Roman Empire.* By HENRY HART MILMAN, D. D., Dean of St. Paul's. In three volumes. A new and revised edition. New York: W. J. Widdleton. 1867. 12mo. pp. 485, 478, 507. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

CHRISTIANITY is both the discord and harmony of history. Forming an integral part of the great struggle of ideas for the last eighteen hundred years, it has proved to be a constant disturbing element in human society, while, at the same time, it has been the only power capable of harmonizing the great conflict of ages, and developing the race to a true civilization.

The very principle of Christianity is aggressive. It is a voice calling the world to a higher and better life. It is a voice, too, terribly in earnest; and it has not failed to make itself heard, though there have been ten thousand voices calling out "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" This fact, in connection with the fact that it is in direct antagonism with the popular traditions and habits of the world, brings on an endless conflict, and is the proper explanation of all the discord it has produced in history.

What it has been, it is to-day.

In those countries where it has been recognized, and its principles practiced, it is a source of peace, harmony, and happiness; but wherever its progress is sternly opposed, it produces discontent, discord, and revolution. And to every reflective man, this is just what might be reasonably expected. Christianity is adapted to the highest interests of men, is intended to bring them into harmony with God and each other; hence, any rejection of it, on the part of men, is a "rejection of the counsel of God against themselves"—a rejection of the only means of human happiness. It must be evident that such madness would carry with it its own punishment. Hence, to study Christianity in its progress in the world, is to study both the wisdom and folly of men. A good history, therefore, on this subject is of incalculable value.

Milman's History has been a standard work for more than twenty years, and this new and revised edition will be hailed with pleasure by all students

of ecclesiastical literature. The three volumes before us cover one of the most important periods in the history of the Church. It is the period of the introduction, first great struggles, triumphs, persecutions, and departures from the simple faith of Christianity.

Situated as we are, at so great distance from that period, it becomes a matter of great importance to us to have a faithful picture of the rise, progress, and corruptions of the Christian religion. The New Testament furnishes us with the historic material for about seventy years, and as this is accessible to all, and is the only reliable history of those years, we are, therefore, not dependent upon human history for the principles and introduction of Christianity. But from the close of the apostolic era, we must look to human sources for all the light we can hope to have thrown upon the struggles of the Church.

Dean Milman traces these struggles through the ten persecutions, giving us a clear *objective* view of the relations of the Church to the world. He is also in a large degree master of the situation, in giving us the *subjective* state of the Church. He carries us, with a masterly skill, through the controversies with the Gnostics, Simonians, Nicolaites, Cerinthians, of the first century; the Basilidians, Carpocratians, Valentinians, Nazareans, Ophites, Patripassians, Artemonites, Montanists, Manicheans, and others, of the second century; the Monarchians, Samosatensians, Noetians, Sabellians, Novatians, etc., of the third century. This *duality* in the history of the Church, that is, its conflicts with the world, and struggles within itself, is an exceedingly important matter, and should receive a careful analysis in any satisfactory ecclesiastical history. And should we ever have a fair, full, and candid history of the period treated by Milman, it will be seen, that in the exact ratio the Church tended toward an alliance with human governments, its inner state, its doctrines, and life became inconsistent, discordant, and fragmentary. True, when the Church was fully established under the secular arm, it was characterized by a sort of mechanical *oneness*, a sort of outside union, but within there was no "unity of the spirit in the bond of peace."

In reference to this point, we can safely say we have no good Church history. The English historians have been chiefly concerned with the outward relations of the Church. They have, for the most part, treated of its objective history; while the Germans have occupied the other extreme, following, in the main, the line of doctrinal conflict and development which marks the internal or subjective relations of the Church.

Milman is the best English writer of ecclesiastical history, for the reason that he perceives clearly, and discusses with considerable ability, this double relation of that history. There is one point in which he is far from being trustworthy. We refer to his treatment of the rise and progress of Diocesan Episcopacy. Here he evidently allows the weight of his deanship to bear

down the facts of history. We do not say that he falsifies history, but he certainly does not tell the whole truth. The Germans are the only writers who have done this subject justice; and even some of these have failed to perceive with clearness the causes which developed this species of Church government. Planck* has treated the subject with as much ability as any other writer, but he even is sometimes not reliable.

It is obvious to any candid and well-informed student of the New Testament and Ecclesiastical History, that Presbyterianism is not the original form of Church government; nor could it have grown out of the primitive system. Diocesan Episcopacy, however, was easy enough evolved from the simple government of the Apostolic Church. The New Testament teaches that there was a plurality of Bishops over every congregation. But it is easy enough to see that one of these Bishops, on account of his superior tact and influence, might gradually become the chief counselor, and control mainly the affairs of the whole congregation. And it is easy to see, furthermore, that one of these chief Bishops might, in time, come to have a voice in the management of several adjacent churches, which would soon give him an influence that would enable him to usurp authority, and have himself declared the Bishop of a particular Diocese. Hence Diocesan Episcopacy, being simply a perversion of the original government, is the oldest transformation of the Church, in its structure, from the simplicity of its primitive organization.

Presbyterianism is an effort to correct the error of Diocesan Episcopacy. It is the result of a reaction against the outrages of a despotic prelacy. The spirit of the thing was right, but it stopped with a system of Church government as wholly unscriptural, though not so objectionable in many of its features, as the perverted Episcopal form. The only hope of the Church to-day is to abandon both of these systems, and return to the simple apostolic order.

The present is a time full of glorious promise for the future of Christianity. Never before has there been a period when men have studied with more interest the history and fortunes of the Church. Every thing that pertains to the religion of Jesus Christ is receiving a new investigation; and, as this earnest examination proceeds, the old systems are abandoned, the old dogmas are no longer insisted upon, while there is almost every where an earnest desire to know the truth as it came from the lips of Christ and his apostles. Hence just now Church history is doubly interesting. A faithful record of the conflicts, trials, truths, errors, triumphs, and failures of the past, will enable us to work with a more enlightened intelligence in the future.

It is said that human history repeats itself. But this is true only because men will not be guided by the experience of the past. If every one

* *Gesch. der christlich-kirchlichen Gesellschaftsverfassung.* Hanov. 1803.

would calmly weigh the facts of history, and seek to make present action correspond to the teaching of that history, we should no longer find humanity going round a circle in its historic evolutions, but, instead thereof, we should behold it moving forward with consistent, steady, and certain steps, toward the highest and noblest civilization.

-
- 2.—*The New Testament: translated from the Greek Text of Tischendorf*, by GEORGE R. NOYES, D. D., *Hancock Professor of Hebrew and other Oriental Languages, and Dexter Lecturer on Biblical Literature in Harvard University*. Boston: American Unitarian Association. 1869. 12mo. pp. viii-570. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

HAVING noticed in the January number of the *Quarterly* the original "*Codex Sinaiticus*," it is with great pleasure that we call the attention of our readers to this translation of the "Greek Text of Tischendorf." Dr. Noyes is already favorably known as a Biblical scholar of high rank, and as a candid, earnest student of the Holy Scriptures. His translation comes to us with a melancholy interest. Although the whole of the MSS. was completed and in the hands of the printer, Death* called the distinguished scholar away from his labors before all the proof-sheets were corrected. This task, however, beginning with the Epistle to the Colossians to the end of the volume, has been faithfully performed by Mr. Ezra Abbot, the Assistant Librarian of Harvard University.

Of the merits of the translation we can not now speak at length. The work has evidently been done with great care, and with a conscientious regard for the exact meaning of the Divine original. Dr. Noyes has succeeded, in a great measure, in what very few translators have done: he has, for the most part, confined himself to the work of a *translator*, and has seldom attempted the business of an *expositor*. This is certainly encouraging, in the very outset of our examination of his work. There are very few translations that are freer from impressions of the theological tenets of the translator than this one. Dr. Noyes was a Unitarian; and, although the Greek text of Tischendorf is supposed to favor somewhat the Unitarian school of theology, it is certain that the Doctor's translation of the Unitarian *proof-texts* is, in the main, true to the original.

We note another recommendation. While the common English version is generally followed wherever there is no special reason for a change, still there is no want of resolution to stick to the requirements of the original when there is a conflict between it and the Common Version. Most versions that have been made upon the basis of the Common Version are not true to the original, or else have such a mixture of old and new style as

* He died June 3, 1868.

to be neither one thing nor the other—a kind of discordant medley of ancient and modern English. We do not say that Dr. Noyes has always steered clear of this difficulty. We think, however, he has done it as well as it can be done by any one who attempts to follow the Common Version at all.

There are some glaring defects, especially in the use of the article, which we hope to notice at considerable length in some future number of the Quarterly. We must content ourselves at present with the quotation of a few passages that have become familiar in theological polemics. We will give the Common Version and Dr. Noyes's translation together, and follow them with the parallel passage from other standard translators, so that our readers may judge of the merits of all:

MATT. XVI, 18.

Common Version: "And I say also unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

Noyes: "And I, on my part, say to thee, that thou art Peter, a rock, and on this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of the underworld shall not prevail against it."

Dr. George Campbell: "I tell thee likewise, thou art named Rock; and on this rock I will build my Church, over which the gates of Hades shall not prevail."

Wakefield: "And, I say unto thee, thou art truly named Peter; and upon this very stone I will build my Church; and the gates of the grave will not prevail against it."

Thompson: "And, also I say to thee, Thou art Peter, a large stone, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

A. Campbell: "I tell you likewise you are named stone; and on this rock I will build my congregation, over which the gates of Hades shall not prevail."

Bible Union: "And I also say to thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of the underworld shall not prevail against it."

Anderson: "And I say to you, that you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it."

JOHN III, 8.

Common Version: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

Noyes: "The wind bloweth where it will; and thou hearest the sound thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

Dr. George Campbell: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh nor whither it goeth: so is every one who is born of the Spirit."

Wakefield: "The breath breathes, in whom it listeth, and thou hearest its voice; but knowest not whence it cometh and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

Thompson: "The Spirit influences where he willeth, and thou hearest his voice, but knowest not whence he cometh nor whither he departeth: so is every one who hath been born of the Spirit."

A. Campbell: "The wind blows where it pleases, and you hear the sound thereof, but know not whence it comes nor whither it goes: so is every one who is born of the Spirit."

Bible Union: "The wind blows where it will, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but knowest not whence it comes, nor whither it goes: so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

Anderson: "The Spirit breathes where he pleases, and you hear his voice, but you know not whence he comes, and whither he goes; so is every one that is begotten of the Spirit."

ACTS II, 38.

Common Version: "Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

Noyes: "But Peter said to them, Repent, and let every one of you be baptized to the name of Jesus Christ, for forgiveness of sins, and ye will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

Wakefield: "And Peter said unto them, Repent, and let every one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for a remission of sins; and ye will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

Thompson: "But Peter said unto them, Repent ye, and let every one of you be baptized for the name of Jesus Christ, unto remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

A. Campbell: "And Peter said to them, Reform, and be each of you immersed in the name of Jesus Christ in order to the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

Hackett: "Then Peter said to them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you, upon the name of Jesus Christ, in order to the forgiveness of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

Lechler: "But Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you, upon the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

Bible Union: "And Peter said to them, Repent, and be each of you immersed, upon the name of Jesus Christ unto remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

Anderson: "And Peter said to them, Repent, and be immersed every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, in order to the remission of sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

I TIM. III, 16.

Common Version: "And without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

Noyes: "And confessedly great is the mystery of godliness, in him who was manifested in flesh, justified in the spirit, seen by angels, preached among the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

Wakefield: "And confessedly great is this mystery of godliness, which was manifested in flesh, vindicated by the spirit, seen by messengers, proclaimed among Gentiles, believed on in the world, taken up into glory."

M'Knight: "For confessedly great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifested in the flesh, was justified through the spirit, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

Thompson: "And confessedly great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen by angels, preached among the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

A. Campbell: "And confessedly great is the secret of godliness; he who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of messengers, proclaimed to the Gentiles, believed on in the world, taken up in glory."

Conybeare: "And without contradiction, great is the mystery of godliness—God was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, beheld by angels, preached among the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up in glory."

Bible Union: "And confessedly great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifested in the flesh, was justified in the spirit, was seen by angels, was preached among the Gentiles, was believed on in the world, was received up in glory."

Van Oostersee: "And without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness, Who was

manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached to the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up to glory."

Anderson: "And confessedly great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in flesh, justified in spirit, seen by angels, preached among the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up in glory."

We would like to pursue these comparisons further, but we can not do so at present. It would be interesting to notice, not only the differences where the translation is from the same texts, but also the differences on account of the original used. The text of Tischendorf is now conceded to be the best, but it differs in many places from the Common Version text as well as the standard Greek text of Griesbach.

Since the completion of Dr. Noyes's translation, the fifth part of Tischendorf's eighth critical edition of the Greek Testament, extending from Luke xviii, 10, to John vi, 23, has been published. This text differs in some places from that of his "*Synopsis Evangelica*," published in 1864, which was followed by Dr. Noyes in his translation of the Gospels. Mr. Abbot has very properly placed a note at the end of Dr. Noyes's work, indicating the new readings. We note only a few: Luke xiii, 17, omits the verse. John i, 18, reads "only begotten Son" for "only begotten God." John iii, 13, adds, at the end of the verse, "who is in heaven." John iv, 9, omits "for Jews have no dealings with Samaritans."

3.—*The Opium Habit, with Suggestions as to the Remedy.* New York: Harper & Brothers. 12mo. pp. 335. 1868. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

IN the late work of M. le Comte de Gobineau on the "*Religions and Philosophies of Central Asia*,"* there is an interesting chapter on Sufism, in which the author alludes to the use of opium and bang as vehicles of religious sentiment, and as exerting a great influence on philosophical speculations. Drunkenness is one of the radical vices of the Orientals. The indolence of the Asiatics seems to breed a fondness for intoxication, and this habit distinctly marks itself on the religions and philosophies of their country.

In some portions of Asia the habit of intemperance prevails to an alarming extent; and that, too, in spite of sumptuary laws and the positive prohibitions of the Koran. Nor is this habit confined to any particular class. Priests as well as princes devote their nights to the wassail-bowl; women and men alike, from the highest to the lowest, spend their evenings in Bacchanalian revels, until, completely mastered by their "cold tea," as brandy is called, they sink down, "dead drunk," on the carpets of the seraglio.

* *Les Religions et les Philosophies dans l'Asie Centrale.* Par M. le Comte de Gobineau. Deuxième édition. Paris: Didier et Cie., Libraires-Editeurs. 1866. 8vo. pp. 543.

But the Oriental does not use intoxicating beverages because they tickle his palate. It is because of the effect upon the system that he gives himself up to a life of intoxication. Stupefaction of the senses seems to be a condition among Orientals necessary to spiritual enjoyment or intellectual progress. Hence, some of the most eminent Persian scholars seldom spend a night without paying their respects to Bacchus. We have in this fact a psychological phenomenon, which, when understood, will enable us the better to understand Oriental character.

In Europe, the habit of intoxication does not prevail to the same extent as in this country. In the wine-growing regions it is not often you see any one who is thoroughly drunk. The writer of this notice traveled through most of the countries of Europe, and saw but one person who was intoxicated "after our American fashion," and he saw that person in England, where brandy and ale are the principal stimulating beverages used by the people. America ranks with Asia in the habit of drunkenness. But the American is influenced by a very different reason from that which controls the Asiatic. It is not so much because the American is indolent that he becomes intoxicated, as it is because he is too active. Hence we have exemplified, in the habits of the Oriental and American, the old proverb: *Les extrêmes se touchent*—extremes touch each other. Though their mental and physical characteristics are as different as possible, yet their fondness for intoxicating beverages is much the same.

The "Opium Habit" is not so general as the use of intoxicating liquors, but is far more fatal, should it once become fixed. But even this habit is much more common than is generally supposed. It can generally be concealed till the subject is almost beyond the reach of a remedy. Hence any work that will serve to warn the people against this fearful habit, or help to break its spell when once formed, should be hailed with pleasure by all lovers of good society.

Since the publication, in the "London Magazine," for December, 1821, of De Quincey's "Confessions of an English Opium Eater," a knowledge of the ravages of this fearful habit has not been confined to the medical profession. De Quincey's article attracted very considerable attention at the time of its publication. So great, indeed, was the anxiety to read its strange revelations, that the article was speedily published in book form, and had a large sale in both England and this country.

Since the appearance of De Quincey's book, much light has been thrown upon the subject; and it is the purpose of the volume before us to collect the experiences of men who have become subjects of this habit, and point out, as far as possible, the means of escape from it. The first writer in this volume relates the experience of one who ate, in fifteen years, "more than half a hundred weight of opium, equivalent to more

than a hogshead of laudanum." Certainly if a knowledge of the subject of which he writes is any guarantee of fitness for the task he has undertaken, we ought to expect a history of great practical utility from the pen of the author of this leading article. That the compiler has given us a valuable work must be frankly admitted; but we can not help feeling, while reading, it that it ought to have been better.

4.—*The Letters of Madame de Sevigne to her daughter and friends.* Edited by MRS. HALE. Revised edition. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 12mo. pp. 438. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

The Letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu. Edited by MRS. HALE. Revised edition. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 12mo. pp. 408. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

It is generally conceded, we believe, that women are better letter-writers than men. They do not consume time with preliminaries, but take you at once *in medias res*, into the very heart of the matter they propose to discuss. Then, a woman sees a thing quicker than a man; her intuitions are truer, and she is more thoroughly *en rapport* with the world around her. She has also a natural grace, a "*curiosa felicitas*," about her style which is peculiarly adapted to letter-writing. Hence, a volume of letters written by a woman is always much more inviting than a volume written by a man.

The republication, in such an attractive form as the volumes before us, of the letters of Madame de Sévigné and Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, will surely be hailed with pleasure by American readers. These letters present us with a picture of one of the most interesting periods in European history, extending from 1655 to 1762. Those of Madame de Sévigné were written during the time when France was at the height of her glory, what the French call their "Augustan Age." The profligate but splendid genius of Louis XIV (who was then the reigning monarch of France) stamped itself upon the whole of European society, and especially upon French society. Never before was there so much wealth, fashion, and pleasure in the French court. In fact, Paris is indebted to that period for whatever of splendor characterizes it to-day.

Madame Sévigné's letters are exceedingly faulty in one respect. Nowhere in them do we find that true female heroism which bravely challenges all encroachments upon virtue. Hence we look in vain for any warnings against the profligacy of the times in which these letters were written. And we can not help suggesting, that while Mrs. Hale was recommending Madame Sévigné as worthy of emulation by American girls, she should have pointed out this seeming defect in the French woman's character. The letters, however, are fine specimens of their kind. They deal with men and things in a manner that is far from being commonplace and prosy.

They are made up of incidents, of conversations, of meetings, of descriptions, and give us at first hand much of the actual life which was then current in France. They are, therefore, in some respects, more interesting and more valuable than a connected history of that remarkable period by some one who was not an actor in it.

Lady Mary Wortley Montagu wrote to her sister thus: "The last pleasure that fell in my way was Madame Sévigné's letters; very pretty they are, but I assert, without the least vanity, that mine will be full as entertaining forty years hence. I advise you, therefore, to put none of them to the use of waste paper." More than a hundred years have now passed away, and we are inclined to think that people generally will conclude, that Lady Mary was at least right in judgment, though she may have been deficient in modesty. Most of her letters were written from the continent, and many of them are of historical value. Those written to her daughter, Lady Bute, give a graphic description of travel, and living pictures of the scenes and persons she met and observed. They show also her deep and earnest attachment to her family, and especially the love she bore to her daughter. While a large portion of her life was spent in the midst of fashionable society, still it is evident, from her letters, that the sweets of domestic peace were far preferable to the gay circles of court life. Although Mrs. Hale thinks her writings are defective in religious feeling, we are compelled to say, nevertheless, that her letters are better reading for American girls than those of Madame Sévigné.

5.—*The Earthly Paradise. A Poem. By WILLIAM MORRIS.* Boston: Roberts Brothers. 16mo. pp. 430. 1868. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

THE author of this volume was unknown in literary circles until "The Life and Death of Jason" appeared. True, he had published, many years before, a volume of minor poems, but this went into oblivion with a score of other like attempts. Hence, when his "Jason" was published, Mr. William Morris was greeted as a new poet, and his work at once subjected to the severest critical ordeal, in order that the rising star might be properly located in the literary firmament.

The result of this close examination of "Jason" was in Mr. Morris's favor. He at once took high position as a poet. It was, indeed, declared by the critics, that, since the time of Chaucer, there had been no such story told in verse as "Jason."

And now that "The Earthly Paradise" has appeared, Mr. Morris's superior merits as a poet can no longer be questioned. The last poem is in much the same style as the first. It is a story, or rather a succession of stories. It is a number of stories taken alternately from the Greek mythology and the legends of Northern Europe. The plot is happily conceived.

A company of Norsemen, after long and fruitless wanderings up and down the earth in search of a Paradise, at last come to an unknown city of Greek origin, where they are received with great kindness by the inhabitants. This city is "The Earthly Paradise," where they spend their time in a peaceful life, made happy by telling each other, at certain monthly festivals, of

"The gentle music of the by-gone years,"

with which imagination fills the glorious past.

The different stories, linked together in the poem, are simply and beautifully told. Evidently the chief aim of the author is to tell a story, and he surely possesses the highest requisite for this task—an almost exhaustless invention. The magic touch of his genius at once transforms Grecian mythology and Northern tradition into living pictures; and as the story goes on so naturally and quietly, you forget that it is fiction, and become interested in every thing as if it were veritable history.

The Prologue is somewhat tedious, and appears to be needlessly long. But it will bear a second reading, and will improve on acquaintance.

Of the stories, the best are "Atlanta's Race," "Cupid and Psyche," and "Pygmalion;" while the worst is "Ogier the Dane," one of the most improbable stories in modern verse, with scarcely a single redeeming characteristic.

Perhaps there is no more striking example, in the whole range of literature, of the superiority of Grecian mythological stories, as suitable for poetic material, over all others, than is found in "The Earthly Paradise." Northern Europe is certainly rich in legendary lore. Germany is especially fruitful in good mythical stories. Still none of these weave into verse like the mythology of the Greeks and Romans. Hence, when Mr. Morris leaves off the "Story of Cupid and Psyche," "The Love of Alcestis," and "The Son of Cræsus," to tell us of "The Writing on the Image" and "Watching the Falcon," he speaks like one whose inspiration is gone, who has left the sublime regions of poetry, and come down to the lowlands of prose.

Mr. Morris excels in his treatment of the characters of Grecian mythology. His delineations are all characteristic of the Grecian age, and, at the same time, are not distasteful to modern culture. All his characters are chaste; nothing indelicate in the slightest degree is ever allowed to appear.

He is, however, simply a story-teller. He is not a poet of the noblest type. He has genius, but it is the genius of invention. He lacks fire. True poetry must blaze. It is not regulated by objective law; it is a law to itself. One gets tired of reading an author who seems all the while as if he were writing for the critics. A little defiance of criticism is sometimes a fine indication in a poet. It gives evidence that a thinker has been turned loose, and that the old must give way to the new. True genius is not a slave; it knows only to rule. It does not obey laws; it makes laws.

6.—*Search after Truth. Addressed to Young Men.* By GEORGE W. EGLESTON. New York: G. P. Putnam & Son. 12mo. pp. 267. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

THE title of this book is certainly inviting. We confess to have opened it with great pleasure. In these days of stirring thought and active investigation, when men are so eager for the acquisition of knowledge as to be not always careful concerning the kind sought, it is quite refreshing to follow an earnest man in search of the truth. And our interest is heightened when we learn that he is a *young* man, and dedicates his book to "The Young Men's Christian Associations of the United States and British Provinces." This much said concerning our prepossessions. We are now frank to say that we were not so deeply interested after we had got fairly into the book. Our appreciation of Mr. Egleston's work was in the exact *inverse* ratio of the amount read. When we read the first sentence: "The progress of young men in moral and spiritual things is mainly dependent on the strength of their confidence in the truth of religion," we were confident that the young man had something valuable to say. And when we came to the following paragraph on the next page, we were sure that we would not be disappointed:

"It is evident, that the more clear and exact the verification of our faith becomes in our mind; the more fully we shall exemplify our religion in our daily life and conduct. Whereas, on the other hand, the more imperfect are our knowledge and grasp of facts which display the truth and importance of religion, the more measured and unsteady will be our regard for its counsels. In the one case, we walk with all the confidence and clearness of men in the light; in the other, our steps are uncertain as those who walk in the glimmering twilight or in the dark."

That talk has the true ring in it, and shows conclusively that the author has a clear conception of the true ground of an earnest religious life. And when he comes to define what faith is, he shows that he is a little in advance of many of the theological schools on that subject.

"When we say 'we believe,' we mean simply, that we are persuaded of the truth of something, whatever the object may be. For instance, if a circumstance were related in our hearing which appeared to be sufficiently credible, or worthy of acceptance, to convince us that the thing stated was really so, we should then be said to 'believe.' To believe, therefore, is, as Bishop Pearson states it, 'an act of the understanding by which we receive, acknowledge, or embrace any thing as a truth.'"

"We can not, however, properly be said to believe any thing which is perfectly apparent to the senses; as, for example, when we feel the sensation of pain, or perceive objects which are before our eyes. In all such and similar cases, we do not say, we *believe* we feel pain, or see an object; we always say, we *know*. When any thing is not of itself apparent to the senses, but rather the result of investigation or testimony, then, if we are led to assent to it as true, we are properly said to 'believe.'"

Those are brave words to be uttered by a young man, and addressed to the "Young Men's Christian Associations."

Chapter IV, on the "Holy Scriptures the Basis of our Faith," is well written and, in the main, correct. Some good things are also said in the

chapter on "Religion a Reality," but the interest of the book begins to diminish in the exact ratio of the pages you turn. The chapter on the "Covenant Relation and its Obligations" is intended to show that *infant baptism* is of Divine origin, and that, therefore, all persons baptized in infancy have entered into covenant relationship with Christ, and, as such, should live the Christian life. It is simply a weak argument for a bad cause. We have no heart to give quotations. The next chapter, on the "Holy Spirit's Influence and Power," only increases our conviction that the author ought to have closed his book at the end of the first chapter. He writes a labored article to prove the orthodox view of the Trinity, for which doubtless he ought to receive a unanimous vote of thanks from the "Young Men's Christian Associations in the United States and British Provinces."

7.—*The Gates Ajar.* By ELIZABETH STUART PHELPS. Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co. 12mo. pp. 248. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

THE writer of this volume is a true woman, and her work is characterized by all the tenderness, delicacy, and pathos of a woman's heart. She has suffered much, and this suffering has prepared her to feel keenly the woes of others. Hence her book is full of consolation for the sorrowing, and will be eagerly read by all who have loved ones "over the River."

Few writers have ever touched more closely on the spirit-land. While following her you often feel as if you were "absent from the body and present with the Lord." But she is sometimes recklessly brave in following a somewhat doubtful philosophy to its ultimate results. That she has gone as far as possible in materializing the occupation of the departed dead, must be apparent to all. There is always a strong temptation, on such themes, to press our inquiries beyond what God has revealed to us, but it is never safe to trust ourselves to such speculations. For, however fascinating they may be, it is better to keep within the bounds of revelation. We must never forget that we "now see through a glass darkly," but after awhile we shall "know even as we are known."

8.—*Providence and Life. Select Sermons preached in the Broadway Church, New York.* By REV. E. H. CHAPIN, D. D. Cincinnati: Williamson & Cantwell. 12mo. pp. 348. 1869.

NEXT to Henry Ward Beecher, Dr. Chapin is, perhaps, the most popular pulpit orator in the United States. And in the elegance of his rhetoric and the massive grandeur of his generalizations, as well as in the impressiveness and beauty of his elocution, he is Mr. Beecher's superior. But his sermons

lack the practical aim, the sharp analysis of men and things, the *kairon gnothi*—the power to perceive and appropriate the present occasion—which characterize the sermons of the Plymouth pulpit orator. Hence Mr. Chapin is not so fully in sympathy with the masses as Mr. Beecher; but his sermons are composed of a finer and more consistent fiber of thought. Mr. Beecher is uneven, sometimes transcendent, but then again almost common-place. But Mr. Chapin, if he does not reach Mr. Beecher's highest points, never sinks to his lowest. Mr. Beecher sparkles, and anon dazzles you with the brilliancy of his thoughts; Mr. Chapin moves on a steady light, shining brighter and brighter to the close of each discourse. Mr. Beecher is the better lecturer, but Mr. Chapin is the better preacher.

This volume contains some of Mr. Chapin's finest sermons, which, bating here and there some denominational tendencies, are worthy to be ranked among the best specimens of sermons in the English language.

-
- 9.—*Theological Discussion, held at Des Moines, June 22, 1868, between W. W. KING, Pastor of the Universalist Society of Des Moines, Iowa, and ALVIN I. HOBBS, Pastor of the Church of Christ, Cherry-Street, Des Moines, Iowa. Reported by J. L. M'CREERY.* Des Moines: Mills & Co. 8vo. pp. 247. 1869.

THE reports of oral theological discussions are generally unsatisfactory. In fact, the discussions are themselves generally unsatisfactory. Very few men have such perfect command of the whole field of theological polemics and such self-control, as will enable them, in extemporaneous speeches, to present much that is of permanent value to the cause of truth. Hence discussions of this kind, if valuable at all, are chiefly of a transient and local benefit.

This discussion on the merits of Universalism can scarcely lay claim to any very great critical value. It is, however, in merit, fully up to a majority of discussions of its kind, and is a clever exhibition of the present phases of the subject in debate. Had Mr. King been equal to his opponent in talent, learning, and understanding of the real issue, the book would be worth a great deal more than it is. Mr. Hobbs did not have opposition enough to command all his strength. His part of the discussion shows commendable preparation, and is managed with skill and force. But the debate is all on one side, and the consciousness of this makes the reader lose interest in the whole.

We doubt whether it is either wisdom or policy to hold discussions with Universalist preachers. Universalism is simply a *theory*, not a *practical* thing. For, if true, no one is any the better or worse for it; and if false—which it surely is—we think there is a better way to overcome its influence for evil than by quarreling with it.

FOREIGN LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

- 10.—*Meister Eckhart, der Mystiker. Zur Geschichte der religiösen Speculation in Deutschland.* Von ADOLF LASSON. Berlin: 1868. (Master Eckhart, the Mystic. A Contribution to the History of Religious Speculation in Germany. By ADOLF LASSON.) 8vo. pp. xx, 354.

WE take great pleasure in calling attention to this book as a really important contribution to the history of thought. Among the forerunners of the Reformation none are more important than the German Mystics of the fourteenth century. Yet, strange to say, up to a very recent period very little accurate information concerning them was to be found. One looks in vain into any extant history of the Church for light in regard to these men. All the "standard" histories, whether German or English, are in the dark here. Neander, who devotes the last section of his history to the "Friends of God," and who dwells with special delight on such phenomena, gives us a confused mass of apparent information in regard to the Mystics and the mystical sects of Germany before the Reformation, out of which it is utterly impossible to gain any clear idea of what they were or wanted. Gieseler, Guericke, Kurz, and Niedner are briefer but not better. Even Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," generally so trustworthy and thorough, is at fault here. Nor are the various histories of philosophy, with a single exception, in their attempts to shed light on the speculation of the earlier German Mystics, any more fortunate. The fourth edition of Gervinus's "*Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung*" is the only work published before the year 1857, that contains any thing at all approaching an adequate exhibition and estimate of the opinions and historic position of Eckhart and his disciples. Not until Franz Pfeiffer, in 1857, published his critical edition of the still extant writings of Master Eckhart, was it possible to form any conception of his importance as a thinker, or to appreciate the extent of his influence on his own and later ages. Through the kindness of Pfeiffer, who placed copies of certain manuscripts at his disposal, Gervinus was able (1853) to afford a glimpse into the real character of the man and his work; but it was only a glimpse, after all. In the year 1864, seven years after the publication of Pfeiffer's book, two attempts were made at an exhibition in detail of Eckhart's doctrine, the one by Joseph Bach, Vienna, and the other by R. Heidrich (Posen). It was not, however, until the appearance of the second edition of Ueberweg's "*Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie der patristischen und scholastischen Zeit*," (Outline of the History of Philosophy in the Patristic and Scholastic Period,) in 1866, that we were in possession of any thing even measurably satisfactory. This edition of Ueberweg's excellent manual (which ought to

be translated into English) was enriched by a section on "German Mysticism in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries," written by Dr. Lasson, who has now given us the full and rich result of his labors in the work before us.

Now, for the first time, we see what Eckhart really was, and in what relation he stood to the Mystics contemporary with him, and to those who succeeded him. Before Schmidt's paper in the "Studien und Kritiken" for 1839, it was even common to regard him as the disciple of Tauler, from the simple fact that few of his writings were known, *as such*, except the discourses which were appended to the Basle edition of Tauler's sermons. Many others were in print, but under Tauler's, Rusbroek's, and Suso's name. Schmidt was convinced that both Tauler and Suso were disciples of Eckhart; even the little he knew of Eckhart was sufficient to make this clear to him. But after Pfeiffer had disclosed the treasures of Eckhart's mind, there was no longer any room for doubt. It only needed that a man should come and place the scattered fragments of the gigantic system in local proximity, in order to show us that this Dominican monk was, among the Mystics, without a rival in the field of thought. This Dr. Lasson has done for us; and we now see what beggars your Taulers and Susos were, in comparison with this Cræsus, at whose groaning tables they were fed. But we will leave him for the present. Perhaps, at some future day, we shall attempt to show our readers more in detail what Eckhart was.

II.—*Israel und die Kirche. Geschichtlicher Ueberblick der Bekehrungen der Juden zum Christenthum in allen Jahrhunderten. Von CHR. K. KALKAR, D. Theol. Uebersetzt von A. MICHELSEN.* Hamburg, Agentur des Rauhen Hauses. 1869. (*Israel and the Church. Historical View of the Conversions of the Jews to Christianity in all centuries. By CHR. K. KALKAR, Dr. Theol. Translated by A. MICHELSEN.*) 8vo.

THERE are very good reasons why this book should be welcomed and appreciated. There is, in the first place, yet a very remarkable ignorance prevalent among Christians generally, (more particularly in some Christian countries,) about the history of the Jews since the Christian era. It is scarcely in place here to inquire why this is so. This ignorance, however, is a reproach both to Christians and to the Jews. The history of the Hebrew race, since their final dispersion from Jerusalem, after the fall of the city, has been one of the most extraordinary in the world's annals. It spreads over the whole earth; not only among civilized, but even among barbarous nations, this wonderful people scattered themselves, lived, often acted a prominent part, and flourished. The Hebrews in their long exile have not been ciphers in the history of nations. In the East, their first home, and in the West, in the North and in the South, they have, through

the ages, made their mark, and become prominent in many of the most eminent paths of human activity. They have taken part in the government of nations, in diplomacy, in finance, commerce, in learning, and in the arts. The martyr history, also, of this people, smitten of God for their great guilt, is a page in history that it would be good for men to know. Christians and Jews are both to blame for the obscurity that yet so largely rests in the general mind over Jewish history since Christ. The dark prejudice against the Jews, but very lately, comparatively, beginning to give way before a more enlightened judgment and charity, prevented Christians from interesting themselves in making the laborious researches necessary to trace truthfully their strange history. The Jews, isolated in mind, in heart, and position within themselves, despised and degraded, bereft of ambition, felt but little motive to collect from the historical treasures scattered among them, and in the archives of the nations, and give freely to the world an account of themselves for the last eighteen centuries. Something has been done in this direction on both sides; but it has been comparatively little. Let a man go through our largest bookstores, and look for good books on this subject, he will seldom find any thing at all. Any thing, therefore, that throws light on any part of this later Jewish history is welcome.

But, in the second place, this book is valuable, because it touches a question of both doubt and interest to Christians, and that is, the receptivity of Jews for Christianity. Few know, and very few believe that, since the primitive Church, Israelites have to any notable extent gone over to a profession of Christianity. This book does much to correct this. Conscientiously and toilsomely Dr. Kalkar has studied this part of Jewish history from the sources themselves. His book embraces the conversions of the Jews in all the countries of Europe, from the centuries past up to our own day. The result will surprise many. To refer only to some of the facts and figures given of the conversions in our own day: Within forty years, in a single province of Prussia, (Silesia,) six thousand Jews embraced Christianity. In Berlin there are at present twenty-five hundred Jewish converts.

An eminent German writer has stated that the number of Jewish converts in our day is proportionately greater than that of Pagan converts.

Both Jews and Christians are disposed often to speak disparagingly of Jewish conversions, as if they were only mercenary. That this may, to a greater or less extent, be true, we are not prepared to deny. But from what we do know of many cases, we are far from sharing the opinion of those who have no faith in Jewish conversions. Such prominent and illustrious names as De Lyra, Tremellius, Cappadose, Da Costa, and Neander, and many others, with whose wonderful history we are familiar, gives us a high appreciation of the deep genuineness of Jewish conversions. There is no man in Holland to-day more devoted in his love to Christ than Dr. Cappadose, and

the name of Neander alone should make men speak with respect of Jewish Christians. We must never forget that not only the Son of God, according to the flesh, but Paul, and Peter, and James, and John, and of old, Moses and David, were Jews. And we add, in the full consciousness of truth, that many of the noblest men within the bounds of Christendom to-day are Jews. Let Israel, with all its sins, not be forgotten.

12.—*Evangelischer Kalender. Jahrbuch für 1869. Herausgegeben von* PROF. DR. FERDINAND PIPER. *Zwanzigster Jahrgang.* Berlin, Wiegandt und Grieben. (Evangelical Almanac. Year-book for 1869. Edited by Prof. DR. FERDINAND PIPER. Twentieth Year.) 8vo. pp. 227.

THIS is one of the most valuable and esteemed of the German religious year-books. The Almanac is the smallest part of it. It is a volume of 227 pages, richly filled with the productions of men of learning and talent, a class to which Dr. Piper himself belongs, who is one of the chief contributors. The leading and heaviest article is usually from his pen. Many of the first religious writers of Germany have enriched the pages of this annual for the twenty years of its existence. In the present number there are articles, among others, from such men as Ahlfeld, Fromann, Heppe, Krafft, Ranke, Plitt, Lechler, Otto, and Krummacher. His contribution to this *Almanac* is the last literary gift of Dr. Krummacher to the German people. It is a touching, eloquent sketch of the noble French Protestant preacher, Dionysius Pelouquin. The writers for this year-book represent the whole of Germany and German France—the Alsace, which latter is represented by Prof Dr. Schmidt, of Strasbourg.

The entire contents of Piper's Almanac are of a religious character. They are divided generally into two divisions: Mixed articles, and Life-pictures. Under the former we have valuable contributions, generally, on some subject of Christian antiquities. These are always weighty, learned articles. This is represented, the present year, by a very elaborate exhibition, covering forty-seven pages, of the sayings or proverbs of the Wise Men of classical antiquity, and their use in the Church. First, we have the Greeks, (Homer, Hesiod,) and the quotations from these found in the later poets and philosophers of Greece; then these Greek poets and philosophers themselves. Secondly, come the Romans and their great writers and poets. The "sayings" are such as bear on the ethical and religious life and character of men, that reveal the moral and religious current of these heathen nations; and that were afterward, as by Paul, used by Christians in their conflicts with Paganism. This article, by Dr. Piper, is highly instructive.

The main body of the book is filled with the Life-pictures. These are short, but otherwise full, sketches of the lives of men notable in the history

of the Church, representing every period and every country where Christianity has been, and in harmony with the title of the book, selecting generally those lives that have had an *evangelical* character. In the present volume we have men of the ancient Church, of the Middle Ages, the Reformation period, and the period after the Reformation; and of countries represented we have Syria, Italy, France, England, Germany, Sweden, the Netherlands, America, and the South Sea Islands. These sketches or pictures are written in fine literary style, with deep religious earnestness, and a true spiritual, evangelical unction, that makes it most delightful and profitable to read them. Among others of these short biographies, we have, of the after-Reformation period, those of William of Orange, Gustavus Adolphus, Paul Rabaut, the famous French preacher of the desert, our own David Zeisberger, the Moravian missionary to the Indians, and John Williams, the apostle to the South Sea.

-
- 13.—*Deutsches Woerterbuch von JACOB GRIMM und WILHELM GRIMM, fortgesetzt von DR. RUDOLF HILDEBRAND und DR. KARL WEIGAND. Vierter Band, zweite Abtheilung, Erste Lieferung. H. Bearbeitet von DR. MORIZ HEYNE. Fuenfter Band, achte Lieferung. Kommend—Krachen. Bearbeitet von DR. R. HILDEBRAND.* Leipzig: 1868. (German Dictionary, by JACOB GRIMM and WILHELM GRIMM, continued by DR. RUDOLPH HILDEBRAND and DR. KARL WEIGAND. Fourth Volume, Second Division, First Part. H. By DR. MORIZ HEYNE. Fifth Volume, Eighth Part. K. By DR. R. HILDEBRAND.) 8vo. pp. 239-239.

THIS dictionary, the most extensive and thorough perhaps in any language, originated with the brothers Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm, who doubtless stood at the head of German philologists of the past and of the present. They both lived to a high and vigorous old age, and by making their mother-tongue a life-long study, shunning to this end no labor and no expense, and enjoying the fullest advantages of a thorough, widely-expanded philological culture in ancient and modern languages generally, especially in the Teutonic tongues and those kindred to them, they were eminently fitted to undertake, in their riper years, a work like this for their nation, a wonderful monument of learning, of research, study, and labor. These two brothers (the Castor and Pollux of German scholars) coöperated to the latest day of their common life most harmoniously in their common pursuits of love; for their literary works were really to them labors of love. They had long matured the idea of this great treasure-house of the German language; and when they had well prepared the immense mass of materials, they set themselves to work. For some time part after part of the dictionary appeared, the work of their mutual labors. Then one suddenly died, and not very long after him his brother. The work was only begun. It was finally decided that so great an enterprise should not fail; it was due to the great

men who had conceived it as a monument and a peerless treasure to the father-land, that the literary piety of Germany should carry the work forward. To Dr. Hildebrand and Dr. Weigand was assigned the task for the present of continuing and directing it; and while we may well feel that the great hand of the fathers is no longer here, yet it is evident that the work has not fallen into incompetent hands.

The dictionary is printed not in German but in Latin type, to make it more readable to those unfamiliar with the German letters. The definitions are always first given in Latin, when possible, as the meaning of the Latin word is fixed and well known. The word is then compared with kindred words or its equivalents, also, in other tongues. Its history is then traced from its earliest known occurrence in the German language, age after age, onward, marking its forms, and illustrating it by chronologically successive quotations; and finally its present meaning or meanings are illustrated, verified, and fixed by ample citations from the classic German writers.

As an evidence of the amount of labor spent in this dictionary on words, we refer to the space occupied by some of them. The dictionary is in two columns to the page, small type, and the page of large octavo form. The word *haben* alone occupies sixteen, and the word *koenig*, five, of these pages.

The work has proceeded as far as into the letter K, and this already is in the fifth volume. It will no doubt yet take a number of years to complete the whole; but when finally done, if continued to the end as its progress has been thus far, the Germans will have a dictionary of which they may well be proud.

-
- 14.—*Juedisches Handwerkerleben zur Zeit Jesu. Fuenf Vortraege im Leipziger Juenglingsverein, gehalten im Winter 1867-68, von FRANZ DELITZSCH.* Erlangen, 1869. (Jewish Artisan-life at the time of Jesus. Five Lectures delivered before the Leipsic Society of Young Men, in the Winter of 1867 and '68, by FRANZ DELITZSCH.) 8vo. pp. 81.

THE name of the author is itself a sufficient guarantee of the solid worth of this book. Delitzsch has already an enviable name for his Biblical erudition; and what he has contributed on the Old Testament belongs to the best we have in that field. His life-long study of all that appertains in language, history, and ancient Jewish works, to the Old Testament and its elucidation, fits him admirably to teach us ancient Jewish life, that is not only interesting in itself, but throws also much light on the New Testament Scriptures.

The topics of the five lectures are:

First Lecture.—The reign of the Herods, and the Second Temple.
Second.—View of Labor and Trades, (or artisan-life,) of that period.
Third.—Higher and lower rank of the various trades. Fourth.—A June-

day in Jerusalem, in the last decade before Christ. The fifth treats of the union of the artisan and the teacher in the same persons.

All that appertains to the public and private, civil and religious life in Jerusalem, and among the Jews of the period immediately before and at the advent of Christ, is here in attractive and instructive pictures, with dramatic effect, brought before us. It leaves the agreeable conviction in the mind, (well sustained also by the entire history of the Jews in the Bible,) that the Hebrews were once, in their own land and in their palmy, proud days, a very industrious people, devoted to all sorts of honorable labor, to agriculture, handicrafts, architecture, etc., and that in their power of invention in the useful arts they had no mean position among the cultivated nations. It was a conviction and general custom among the Jews of that day, that every man, however well-born and rich, or whatever his other attainments and pursuits, should master a trade. Labor was highly honored among them. So Paul was an artisan, and in his life illustrated the wisdom of giving, among the better classes, a trade to the youth. Nowhere was the *practical wisdom* of human life ever so fully brought out and perfected, in maxim and life, as among the Hebrews. Hence the *Wisdom-literature* (as it is technically called) of the canonical and uncanonical Jewish books is so extensive and so rich; the world has really nothing to compare with it. The dignity of labor is the fruit of the teaching of the Old Testament; and the sublime fact that the Jewish (the Biblical) Messiah was a carpenter, has stamped upon labor the seal of Divine approbation and nobility.

The poor "Wandering Jew," the banished exile of ages, has been driven generally to the only resource his condition left open to him, to traffic in merchandise and money; and the unwholesome influence of a general national devotion to this, and a separation from agricultural, mechanical, and other honorable labor, has told fearfully on this wonderful race. But so it would and will on any other. But wherever the Jew has had for a considerable time a firm position and free opportunities, he has shown, in our day, an aptitude and readiness for the artisan's life, and for the higher and nobler pursuits of human mind, for learning and the arts.

REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES.

1.—*Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie.* 1869. *Erstes Heft.*

PROF. DR. EHRENFEUCHTER opens the new year of this periodical with a very readable and, in some respects, quite valuable article on "Secular and Sacred Eloquence." It is in reality a discussion of the relation of the sermon to the rules of rhetoric applicable to other forms of public speaking. The article begins with a sketch of the development of the various species

of artistic eloquence among the ancient Greeks, the laws of which were finally codified by Aristotle and essentially reproduced by Cicero and Quintilian. This is followed by an attempt to fix the origin and essence of distinctively religious eloquence, and this by an excellent illustration of the genesis of a sermon, which is full of fine practical suggestions. One of Dr. Ehrenfeuchter's remarks strikes us as peculiarly apt, and worthy of being taken to heart by many of our modern preachers. After the sermon has been written, either in full or merely in outline, he says: "The last step still remains to be taken, to make the fully-formed sermon audible in the congregation! Not until then does it attain similarity to the original Word of God, and only thus does it become a true reproduction of that Word. *A sermon is the sounding voice of the Gospel.* No preacher should say that his sermon is done, as inconsiderate habit so often leads men to say, before it has been poured out of a full heart over his lips." Finally, after having followed the sermon from the first embryonic stage up to its perfect and sonorous form, the author proceeds to determine its place in relation to rhetoric in general. He regards it as the highest form, the transfiguration, of eloquence.

The next article is a continuation of Dr. Köstlin's "Studies concerning the Moral Law," which is followed by two addresses in memory of Schleiermacher, delivered on his centennial birthday, the one at the University of Göttingen by Dr. L. Duncker, and the other at the University of Tübingen by Prof. Sigwart. Dr. Steitz, of Frankfort, brings up the rear with a defense of his position, taken in a former article, in regard to "John the Apostle and John the Presbyter."

2.—*Der Katholik. Zeitschrift für katholische Wissenschaft und kirchliches Leben.*
December, 1868. January, 1869.

THE December number of "The Catholic" contains the conclusion of the article on the "Blood-phials of the Catacombs," the first installment of which we noticed in the *Quarterly* for January. The only other noticeable article is one on "Cardinal Herzan and others of Joseph the Second's Court-theologians." As might be expected, the writer has dipped his pen in the bitterest gall. The very name of Joseph II is enough to make the hair of any man of ultramontane principles stand on end; and, of course, those Catholic theologians and ecclesiastical dignitaries, who were favorable to his reforms, and assisted him in carrying them out, are the objects of the most intense hatred.

The January number opens with an article on the coming "Œcumenical Council," which is a model of that Jesuitical jugglery which it would be a perversion of language to call reasoning. The thesis of the writer is, that the General Councils of the Church have always succeeded in what they

undertook, and that history proves it. He says: "It can be shown that all the great problems of the Church have been solved by General Councils with never-failing success." He admits that, in the Middle Ages, "the adversary" struck "five heavy blows at the kingdom of Christ" (=the Romish Church), two in the Orient, and three in the Occident. In the East, Mohammedanism and the Greek schism arose; in the West, the conflict between the Papacy and the Empire, the countless sects of the Middle Ages, and the great western schism, which ended in the Reformation. Well, the second, third, and fourth Lateran condemned all sorts of heresies; the first Council of Lyons was held for the purpose of calling forth the Crusades; the second Council of Lyons proposed to reunite the Greek and Latin Churches; the first Lateran and the first Lugdunense maintained the power of the Church over against that of the Empire; the Council of Constance sought to nip the Reformation in the bud, and that of Trent to render it of non-effect. The historian stands and asks, Were the heresies rooted out? was Mohammedanism destroyed? were the Greek and Latin Churches united? did the Church succeed in conquering the secular power? and was the Reformation overcome, is there no "schism" any more, are we all within the pale of the mother Church? If so, what is the use of convoking Vaticanum No. I, and inviting us all to come back?

Letting the Œcumenical Council go for what it is worth, we would call attention to an interesting article on the meaning of the slap on the cheek at confirmation, and to the continuation of the series on "Italian Philosophy at the Present Day."

3.—*Revue Chretienne. Paris. 1869. January and February.*

THESE two numbers of the "Christian Review" are rich in matter. In the first, we have the first of the two articles, promised by M. Ernest Naville, on "The Adversaries of Philosophy." He divides the modern adversaries of philosophy into two classes. "The first class declares the exercise of the intellect to be pernicious, and invites men to accept, without examination, the doctrines presented to him by tradition. This is the view which Abbé de Lamennais developed with the most brilliant talent and the most vehement passion. The other class accords to the intellect the right and the power to coördinate the facts of experience, and thus to establish a certain number of particular sciences, but it rejects, as chimerical, the pretension of discovering, beyond experience, the cause, the ground, of the existence of these facts, and of rising to the consideration of a primitive unity, from which all things proceed." The first class the writer dispatches with a few words, as having but little weight in the controversies of the present day, and then turns the whole power of his intellectual artillery on the second, which is

composed, of course, of Positivists and Materialists. In this first installment of his article, he takes in hand M. Ausonio Franchi and Herr Louis Büchner, of "Force-and-Matter" notoriety, and exhibits them in their naked deformity. The style and the general treatment of the subject are admirable, and if the second article keeps the promise of the first, perhaps we shall give our readers the benefit of a translation.

M. Naville's paper is followed by a lengthy article entitled "Milton, the Puritan," from the pen of M. Matth. Lelièvre. Milton is, as might be expected, almost unknown in France. Little has been done to make the French people acquainted with him. For Voltaire, Milton was "the author of a barbarous poem, sometimes sublime, on Adam's apple;" for Victor Hugo, he was a fanatic and a declaimer; and for M. de Lamartine, a peg on which to hang his own windy and empty declamations. It is, therefore, a pleasant surprise to read, in a French review, such an appreciative article on the author of *Paradise Lost*, as the one before us, which was occasioned by the appearance of a work entitled "*Milton, sa vie et ses œuvres*," by Edward de Guerle, who, in the years 1861-3, contributed a number of articles on the same subject to the *Revue Chrétienne*. In the February number there are two articles of special interest, one on "The Gospel in Spain," and the other on "The Ignorance of the Holy Scriptures in France in the Nineteenth Century."

-
- 4.—*Waarheid in Liefde. Een godgeleerd Tijdschrift voor Berschaafde Christenen. Naar de Behoeftte dezer Dagen.* (Truth in Love. A Theological Journal for Educated Christians. According to the Demands of the Age.) Groningen. Holland. 1869. *January*.

THIS excellent religious monthly, which has been published since 1866, by Hofstede de Groot and other able theologians, is the organ of that party in the Dutch Church which is opposed to dogmas, but holds fast to Christianity—the so-called Groningen School. The leading article, in the present number, is entitled, "The Present Condition of Religious Parties," and seems to be the first of a series on this topic. The intention is to discuss thoroughly the character of the various parties to the great religious controversy of the present day. Before doing this, the writer proceeds to set the point at issue in a clear light. "There has always been conflict in the Christian Church, but the point about which men have fought has been shifted from time to time. So the conflict has been continually changing its character. Although many a doctrine, which has been the object of controversy, continually reappears as such, it is, nevertheless, in another connection and with another meaning." Glancing rapidly at the various points of controversy in past centuries, the writer then puts the question: "What is, at the present time, the central point of controversy in religious matters?" Many think it is

to be found in the domain of historical criticism ; he is of a different opinion. For him it is in "the acceptance or rejection of Supernaturalism." This being settled, he addresses himself to the exhibition and trial of Naturalism, with which the present article concludes. This is followed by a paper entitled "Israel and Jesus Christ—Conversation with a Jew," communicated by Hofstede de Groot. Then comes an article with the caption "Paul, the Chief of Sinners," by A. van Toorenenbergen ; and finally one on the "Acts of the Apostles."

5.—*Theologische Studien und Kritiken*. 1869. *Erstes Heft*. Gotha.

THIS is one of the ablest of the German theological quarterlies. It was founded by Dr. Ullmann and Dr. Umbreit, and many of the ablest of the Protestant theologians of Germany have contributed to its pages. It is now in its forty-second year, and is edited by Dr. Hundeshagen and Dr. Riehm. It represents, in the highest sense, the evangelical side of German theology, and belongs to the *Reformed* school, rather than the Lutheran.

Under the division of *Abhandlungen*, or elaborate original articles, we have in the present number, 1. *Apocalyptic Studies*, a very thorough investigation of the Book of Revelation, by Prof. Dr. Weiss. 2. *The Fundamental Traits* (Grundzuege) of *Christ's Doctrine of Salvation in the Synoptics*, i. e., in Matthew, Mark, and Luke, by Diaconus Herman Weiss. 3. A short review of the old historian and moralist, Hermann von Reichenau, of the eleventh century. Under *Thoughts and Observations*, (second division,) there is an article, by Tholuck, discussing the modern Lutheran doctrine of the Sacrament of the Supper, in which he shows that modern Lutheranism has evidently and essentially departed from Luther's doctrine. The second article under this head is an interesting account of the martyrdom of Johannes v. Draendorf, who was burnt by the Catholic Church at Worms in 1425. In the *Recensions* we have a review of an admirable work by Kritzler, entitled *Humanity* (Human Culture) *and Christianity*. From the review and the passages quoted, we judge that this work is of a high order of merit. It takes a decided stand against the modern, unbelieving, materialistic pretensions against the Holy Scriptures and the Christian faith. It shows that the "Culture" that arrays itself against Christianity is a false one ; and that true "Culture" and Bible go together. We feel tempted to give some short passages from the book to show its tenor and bearing, as it is so cheerful after the long night of religious unbelief that not long since rested over German Christianity, a bright day from on high is rising higher and higher over the land. Of these materialistic philosophers he says : "It is narrow prejudice, when they, dazzled by the riches of creation which they see in one domain, recognize no other domains ; it is presumption, when they, wherever the demands of faith

come in conflict with their theories, insist that faith shall at once surrender at discretion. In our day is yet true of this modern materialistic philosophy the word of Plato, ἡ ἀληθινὴν ψευδοῦς," (the *material* is the real falsehood). "They deny the Beyond, because, as they say, they know only what is here, and deny the Spirit, because, as yet, no anatomist and physiologist has discovered it with the microscope and the dissecting knife. The denials of that in which rests not only all foundation for the past, but in like manner also all liberty, morality, happiness, and responsibility; these infidel pronouncements of the deification of the flesh, that, reposing on the authority of science, are heard on the streets; these men, who declare piety toward God a folly: no wonder if all this reminds pious Christians of the apocalyptic beast that rises up from the abyss and testifies against the truth." Of the modern rationalistic Bible-criticism he says: "What stands as a holy temple in history, as a living fountain of life in the heart, became in its hands a chaotic pile of ruins. Christ became Renan's Child of Nature, that charmed the women, Schenkel's Redeemer, to whom every thing is wanting that could redeem. . . . To-day, in spite of all attempts at concealment, we stand in the face of the dilemma; the appearance of Jesus was either that of the Son of God, or that of a deceiver and one deceived." It is evidently a book written with the deepest earnestness, with eloquence, and with extraordinary power, just such a book as the present hour in Germany demands.

6.—*Theologischer Jahresbericht*. 1869. *Vierter Jahrgang*. *Erstes Quartal*.

THIS is a Quarterly of some hundred and twenty-six pages, that devotes itself to giving reports of the theological works appearing in Germany; of the more important of these full notices and reviews, at some length, are given. It offers a good view of the spirit and tendency of German theological and religious literature. The subjects discussed are themselves an object of interest and of study. This number gives only the books that appeared from January to March of 1868. We notice quite a number of solid works on Exegetical and Historical Theology, the latter embracing the general domain of the Church history and the "Culture-history" of humanity, and many special fields of modern ecclesiastical history. The Germans have been and are remarkable for the large attention they give to this department of study and writing; because their universities cultivate Church history in a high degree, and perhaps, also, because Germany in the past centuries is a vast, rich field of historical interest. The best, as well as the most, Church histories, general and particular, are from German hands.

We observe also that the conflict between Rationalism and Evangelical Christianity in Germany is actively employing the German mind, and is

giving birth to a good number of books, large and small. The evangelical party is evidently mustering its strength, and marching bravely and well-armed, and in strong numbers, into the field. Some very solid works are coming from the theologians on that side; their opponents, among these the busy, inevitable Dr. Schenkel, of Heidelberg, are also not inactive.

The controversy on Romanism is occupying a good deal of literary attention, and a considerable number of books, and a still larger number of *brochures*, this light but effective artillery in literary warfare, are announced from the press.

Germany without Philosophy is inconceivable. The discussion of philosophy in its relations to Christianity is a constant and endless theme for German theologians, especially Protestant theologians. Every year adds a number of books to the already multitudinous philosophy-and-religion literature of Germany.

One of the best signs in the religious literature records is the number of books devoted to woman, and written for woman. All honor to Germany for this! There is also a peculiarity of the Germans that is prominent in the catalogues of religious books, and that is the vast number of *Sermons* published. This comes under the head of *Religious Ascetic Literature*, that intended for private religious edification and culture. This section is well represented in the book lists. One of the fullest divisions is that announcing works on *Hymnology* and *Church Music*. The Germans cultivate this field as no other people; the number of new productions the creative musical mind, perhaps we should say, *soul*, of Germany brings annually into being, is truly wonderful. One of the chief joys of the Germans, besides their philosophy, is music and song.

As a curiosity, we may add, in conclusion, that the Leipzig press announces a Greek religious book, published by *Wigand*, and written by *Andreas K. Demetrakopoulos*. Its title, translated into English, is *History of the Schism of the Latin from the Greek Orthodox Church*. While the book, according to the notice given of it, does not claim great merit for originality and force, still it is a good sign of the rising life of the modern Greek mind.

7.—*Unsere Zeit. Deutsche Revue der Gegenwart.* 1869. *Erstes, zweites, dritte u. viertes Heft. January and February.*

WE mention this periodical, at this time, more especially for the purpose of calling attention to two articles by Prof. Schleiden on "Darwinism and the Doctrines connected therewith." As a contribution to the history and criticism of the development-theory they are well worth reading.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

SPAIN.—This country continues to be an object of great interest religiously as well as politically. Since the beginning of this year, the spirit and conduct of the Provisional Government has shown no signs of retrogression in the path of religious toleration on which it entered immediately on its establishment. All its declarations and actions reveal an honest and fixed purpose to destroy the terrible, inquisitorial, persecuting, and bloody religious intolerance of Spain, that, inaugurated and supported by the Catholic priesthood, has held bloody sway there for centuries, and up to the very hour of the departure of the bigoted Bourbon Isabella.

The Provisional Government has, during the past three months, in proclamations, addresses, answers to deputations, in letters, and in many other ways, reaffirmed the determination to establish free toleration of religion. A strong tendency has been manifested among the people, especially in Madrid, to support this determination. There is evidently, however, a powerful influence of the Catholic priesthood, and without a struggle, the latter, working through the bigoted masses, will not yield up the day. Referring to this secret *reactionary* influence of the clergy, the Government, in its proclamation of January 25th, while speaking of the murder of the Governor of Burgos, says, that "it will be an indelible stain on the Spanish nation, if upon it should rebound the opprobrium aroused by those who, to carry out *their sinister desires*, did not hesitate at seeking to arouse the troubles of civil war, *nor shrink from changing the words of charity and liberty, which are portions of*

Christianity, into deeds of blood and extermination, even as was done in ages gone by.

"The Government has seen and observed in silence, but not unheedingly, a development of a *conspiracy* formidable not on account of the number or the valor of its authors, *but by its evident object to rekindle religious fanaticism*, and to stir up one of those fratricidal wars of which history has drawn so sad a picture, and in which catastrophes similar to that at Burgos are but as episodes." This passage, beyond all doubt, refers to the secret machinations of the *religious* leaders of the people—the priesthood. On the opening of the Constituent Cortes, also, the Ministers, in explaining their actions, stated, among other things, that "*the Jesuit College of St. Vincent was suppressed because its members were engaged in a conspiracy against the Government, and three of its members were accomplices in the murder at Burgos.*"

As was done, on the first inauguration of religious toleration and the suppression of priestly absolutism in other Catholic countries, as France, Mexico, and Italy, so also in Spain, the Provisional Government decreed the confiscation to the State, that is, the *secular utilization* for the actual good of the nation, of the enormous treasures lying heaped up for centuries in the Spanish Churches, partly also for the safe-keeping of treasures of art deposited there, and that were disappearing. The Governor of Burgos, by virtue of an order from Madrid, was proceeding, accompanied with proper officers, to take an inventory of the treasures in the cathedral of that city, when the archbishop in fury cried out

"Thieves, thieves!" the priests around him raised mad shouts of imprecations; the maddened crowd fell on the Governor, and with the blow of an ax struck him to the ground. They then, while the wretched man was yet living, tore out his eyes, and otherwise mutilated him, and finally cut off his head, and would have dragged the body through the streets, had not the armed police scattered the priest-incited mob. The archbishop has been arrested, with others of his priest-family, and the Government have declared that "the crime of Burgos will receive a prompt and exemplary chastisement, *let the authors thereof, or those who have incited or been accomplices in it, be they who they may.*" It is quite clear to whom this language points. The Government issued a special proclamation to the Spanish nation on the subject of the event at Burgos; and at Madrid the popular excitement, in consequence of this assassination, was so great that the Pope's Nuncio was singled out as the special object of the people's vengeance, and it was only by the protection afforded to the Nuncio by the other foreign ministers, and by the action of the Government to suppress the disorder, that he escaped. This in Madrid! The Pope was about to withdraw his minister, and he had already prepared to leave, when, on assurance given that M. Franchi should be protected and respected, he was allowed, for the present, to remain.

Protestant worship has been openly established at Madrid. The brave and gifted Protestant pastor, Ruet, a native Spaniard, but for years an exile, and laboring among his countrymen in Algiers, has now returned, and is preaching to crowded audiences. Governmental protection and countenance is publicly and most liberally given to Protestant religious activity. A large piece of ground has been sold by the Government, on the Promenade de Bilbao, for the building of a Protestant church, and by the authority of the Cortes, or national assembly, the work of erecting the edifice has begun.

Among the most important reforms inaugurated is that of a system of public common schools, on an excellent plan, the details of which, for the want of space, we are unable to give here; but it will be a great power to emancipate the people from their past tutelage under the priesthood.

SWITZERLAND.—The Protestant (Reformed) State Church of Switzerland is coming more and more under the dominion of the latent forms of rationalism. This is true especially of the German Cantons, but also of the French—Geneva, Pays de Vaud, Neuchâtel. The cantonal authorities, in the control they exercise in the appointment of pastors, professors, and teachers, give encouragement to this "liberal Christianity," as it rejoices to call itself. Switzerland but follows Germany in this, at whose feet it sits. There is, however, in the mean time, a very perceptible evangelical element in all Protestant Switzerland, that is growing also daily in strength and earnestness. In the French Protestant Cantons this evangelical influence is making itself felt. The school of Gausen, Malan, and D' Aubigne is a leaven that is slowly leavening many hearts. Besides this, the influence from the evangelical parties in France—the evangelical element in the Reformed National Church of France, which is not insignificant, of the Free French Churches, and of the French Methodists—is also making itself felt. In the German Cantons there is also a goodly number that do not "bow the knee" to this Baal of unbelief. An attempt has been made by the predominant "liberal" party to get rid of what has been, for a long time, a great "inconvenience" and "oppression to their consciences," and that is, the repetition, according to the ritual of the Swiss Reformed Church, of the Apostles' Creed, in which the great fundamental truths of the Gospel are declared. They do not believe in these, and therefore a movement has been made by them, as by the "liberal" party in the Reformed

French Church, to remove the Creed, this "rock of offense," from the Church service. This has opened a war in which both parties are showing a good deal of spirit. A polemical book has just been published in Zurich, defending the retention of the Creed. It is by I. R. Wolfensberger, pastor in Zollikon, Canton Zurich, and is entitled, "The Zurich Church Prayers, in their Historic Development."

There is a prospect also, that, in obedience to the progressive spirit of the age, there will be, in the not far future, a separation of Church and State in Switzerland, as in other free lands. Now it is a curious and noteworthy fact, that it is precisely these "liberals" that, in France and Switzerland, dread this event, as fatal to them. They are aware that the hour that the State ceases to give them dominion and pecuniary support, they will have to rely on the voluntary choice and support of the people, and the latter will not be obliged, willing or unwilling, to support them. Hence the day of their rule is gone.

GERMANY.—In Prussia there still continues a good deal of trouble with the Lutherans that refuse to be merged into the National Prussian Church called the Union. This Union, effected largely through the efforts of the last kings, (chiefly the late King William IV, brother of the present monarch,) is a merging into one of the German Reformed and the Lutheran elements, the former being predominant in numbers and influence. The leading religious men of Prussia, such as Tholuck, Krummacher, and a host of others, belong to this United Church. In other parts of Germany, as well as in America, these two sister Churches, so very intimately allied, also laid by their distinctive confessional peculiarities, and formed Church unions, sometimes old Lutheran, sometimes Reformed preachers, becoming pastors of these Churches. The German Reformed Churches generally, with all readiness, gave in their adhesion to this Union in

Prussia. The old Lutheran element is far more unyielding, and in many instances boldly stood out against any coalescence with the other Churches. In several of the older, especially the eastern, provinces of Prussia, as Posen, for example, the old Lutheran element maintained, determinedly, a separate existence. Throughout the kingdom generally, also, separate Lutheran Churches, or associations of Churches, obstinately resisted all efforts at drawing them into the Union. The Government has unweariedly labored to win them over, but without much success. Up to the victorious campaign which culminated at Königgratz, this question of Union and Lutheran separation was, as the Germans would call it, one of the "burning" religious questions in Prussia, engaging the constant attention of the Government, and also the religious Protestant press, in perpetual discussions. Almost every one of these papers, in every number, had something to say about the everlasting topic of "the Union" and "the Lutherans." The annexation, through the great victories of Prussia, of Hanover, and several other lesser lands to the Prussian kingdom, has greatly increased this trouble, as it has enlarged the area of the strife. These annexed "lands" bear, of course, no particular good-will to the House of Brandenburg. They feel that, as a great calamity, the great dragon has swallowed them up. We are willing, they tell you, to be Germans, but not Prussians. The religious element is always the strongest in man, and the last to yield. So, in these conquered, "annexed" lands, the clergy were the last to renounce their old allegiance and swear to the new. This is true especially in the kingdom of Hanover—that was. Here the Lutheran clergy, with no good-will either to the State or the Church of Prussia, stood out a long time. After the annexation, efforts were immediately made to bring all the Churches—that is, the Lutheran and Reformed—into the Union. This caused great excitement to

the Lutherans, who, as in Hanover, are sometimes in the majority. Great efforts are made by them to resist every such effort; to assert and maintain their strict separate existence; and finally to induce the Government, as a matter of right to them, to recognize them as on a full equality with the United State Church, and, as such, to grant to them an equal State support. This is one of the chief controversies now among the ruling Protestants in Prussia. This controversy is carried on with great vigor, and often with much bitterness, the Lutheran party generally showing more of this than their opponents. They are appealing to all the great memories and inspirations of the past great days of Lutheranism; of the devotion of the Lutheran fathers to the doctrines of Luther. They are reviving, in many respects, the old points of controversy between them and the Reformed. They are laboring also to arouse a strong spirit of enthusiasm and devotion by taking the position of the persecuted confessors of their reformation-faith, the Gospel-faith. The Lutheran spirit, when genuine and once aroused, is quite able to match the spirit of the sister Church, that has always shown a milder and a more charitable disposition. The Lutheran spirit is strong, stern, and unyielding. Some of these Lutherans go so far as to declare that the minister that gives the communion to a member of the Reformed Church has denied the faith, and is guilty of sin. The Lutheran clergy are seeking to get up great "mass-movements" and "demonstrations" in behalf of their cause, and in every way are rousing up opposition to the efforts of the Government and the Union to bring them over, and "rob them of their rights." They might, of course, in peace maintain a separate position, *independent* of the Government; this, however, is wholly inconceivable to them, as the idea of a Church and State Union, and of subvention from the State, is so strictly a Lu-

theran idea that the Lutheran Church, in the Old World, can not imagine or endure existence without it. This notion is much stronger with them than with the Reformed Church.

The question of common schools, that is, *unconfessional* schools, where no religious creed is taught, is also beginning to excite a good deal of attention in Prussia, as in other parts of Germany and in Hungary. It is very difficult for a Pedobaptist State Church, and such State Churches all are, to give up the idea of these confessional schools; yet it will have to come to this at last.

BADEN.—At Mannheim the question of common unconfessional schools was submitted to the vote of the people, on the 29th of January, and it was carried in their favor. Heretofore Protestants and Catholics had separate schools; now the schools will be "mixed," that is, common. Many Catholics voted for it, and almost all the Protestants. Cannon were fired, flags displayed, and other signs of joy given, in honor of this triumph of free thought over ancient religious bigotry.

HUNGARY.—The Hungarian Minister of Religious Affairs and of Instruction laid before the Reichstag the scheme of a law for the organization of popular schools. The Protestants are especially opposing this new law, as it tends to abolish their separate confessional schools. According to it, the Ministry of Public Instruction has the right to control the confessional as well as the unconfessional schools, so as to examine the teachers, and mode of teaching, as to their fitness; and if the separate religious schools prove themselves unsatisfactory, they are at once to be dissolved, and national schools, freed from any special creed teaching, are to take their place. After this plan was reported on by a committee of competent persons, it was finally acted on by the Reichstag, and, with slight modifications, adopted.

EDITORS' ROUND TABLE.

UNSECTARIANISM AND THE DOCTORS.—Some of our exchanges are evidently in trouble about our effort to publish an unsectarian Review. They can not see how such a thing can be done, and hence declare that our express purpose to advocate "Primitive Christianity, as distinguished from the religion of Sects," is "rather presumptuous, and certainly the quintessence of sectarianism."

Now, we confess to a kind of sympathy for these theological doctors. They have been so long under the despotism of human creeds, that it is with great difficulty they can understand the freedom of the Gospel. They have been so much in the habit of listening to the traditions of men, it is not strange they should denounce an effort to return to the simple faith and practice of the Apostolic Churches a "specious plea" and, at best, nothing but "sectarian unsectarianism."

We are told that "bodies of men, who agree in their general interpretation of the New Testament, can efficiently associate together to worship God, according to their understanding of the revealed modes and spirit of that worship, and to labor for the propagation of the religion of the New Testament, as they understand and believe it. Without this common interpretation and this bond of union and sympathy, the Church, as a whole, and the denominations, as sects, would be but ropes of sand."

It is here declared that an agreement in a "general interpretation" of the New Testament is quite possible. In fact, "without this common interpretation," the Church and the denominations would be in a sad plight. Very well. But if an agreement in a "general interpretation" is possible, is it not likewise possible to have an agreement in every thing that the New Testament teaches? And if the first is so important, may not the last be important also? It must be evident to all, that the New Testament can be *understood*, or it *can not*. If it can not, then all responsibility is at an end; but if it is a *revelation* of the Divine Will to man, (which it surely is,) then it is the duty of every Christian to labor for an agreement, not only in general matters, but in every thing that belongs to the Christian life. This is our purpose. And while we treat every one who may differ from us with candor and fairness, we shall not fail "to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." We believe the only way to come to the "unity of the faith and the knowledge of the Son of God," is to *labor* for it. That the whole subject of Christian union is involved in difficulty, we readily grant. But surely we shall never solve this difficulty by resting satisfied with the matter as it now stands. The spell of sectarianism must be broken; the conscience must be freed from the shackles of human systems, and then we can hope for a return to the apostolic faith and practice.

THE CATHOLIC TELEGRAPH ON THE RAMPAGE.—The first number of the *Quarterly* seems to have seriously affected the nerves of the special organ of his Reverence, the Archbishop of Cincinnati. We congratulate the friends of truth upon these archiepiscopal manifestations. Nothing could be better to display the *true spirit* of Catholicism than the four or five columns of editorial matter which recently appeared in the *Catholic Telegraph* concerning the *Christian Quarterly*. "Whom the gods will destroy they first make mad."